



# ***Daily Report***

## **Soviet Union**

FBIS-SOV-91-079  
Wednesday  
24 April 1991

# Daily Report

## Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-079

### CONTENTS

24 April 1991

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An \* indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

#### WORLDWIDE ISSUES

|                                                                      |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| TASS Reports Ignatenko Briefing 23 Apr .....                         | 1 |
| TASS Reports Churkin Briefing 23 Apr .....                           | 1 |
| Amnesty International Cited on Improved Rights [PRAVDA 16 Apr] ..... | 2 |

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

##### United States & Canada

|                                                             |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Bessmertnykh, Baker To Meet in Caucasus 25 Apr [TASS] ..... | 3 |
| Baker's Mideast Tour Reviewed [Moscow International] .....  | 3 |

##### Northeast Asia

|                                                                                  |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| PRAVDA Assesses Tokyo Summit Outcome .....                                       | 3  |
| Japan 'Has Become Much Closer' [20 Apr] .....                                    | 3  |
| 'Breakthrough Not Achieved' [22 Apr] .....                                       | 5  |
| IZVESTIYA Views Outcome of Japan Visit [20 Apr] .....                            | 6  |
| Gorbachev Interviewed on Relations With Japan [Moscow TV] .....                  | 7  |
| Eduard Shevardnadze Comments on Tokyo Talks [KOMMUNISTSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Apr] ..... | 7  |
| Observer Ponders Asian Security Questions [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Apr] .....         | 8  |
| TASS on Developing Ties With ROK .....                                           | 10 |
| Prospects for Inter-Korean Relations Viewed [Moscow International] .....         | 10 |

##### East Europe

|                                                                          |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Honecker Transferred to Krasnogorsk Hospital [Hamburg BILD 23 Apr] ..... | 11 |
| Bessmertnykh-Honecker Meeting Alleged [Berlin ADN] .....                 | 11 |

#### NATIONAL AFFAIRS

##### Supreme Soviet

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Decision on Anti-Crisis Program Reported [TASS] .....              | 12 |
| Supreme Soviet Proceedings 23 Apr Detailed [Moscow TV] .....       | 12 |
| Pavlov Answers Questions [TASS] .....                              | 14 |
| Pavlov Concluding Remarks [Moscow Radio] .....                     | 14 |
| Pavlov Presents 'Anti-Crisis' Action Program [PRAVDA 23 Apr] ..... | 15 |

##### Political & Social

|                                                                      |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Gorbachev Meets With Nine Republic Leaders [TASS] .....              | 25 |
| Republics' Interparliamentary Conference Ends [TASS] .....           | 25 |
| Pavlov on Soyuz State of Emergency Appeal [IZVESTIYA 24 Apr] .....   | 25 |
| Ignatenko on State of Emergency Introduction [TASS] .....            | 26 |
| Predicts Gorbachev Criticism at Plenum [Moscow TV] .....             | 26 |
| Attacks on Gorbachev, Plenum Outcome Eyed [IZVESTIYA 24 Apr] .....   | 27 |
| Rostov Proposes Plenum Vote on Gorbachev [Moscow TV] .....           | 28 |
| Gorbachev Neglect of Party Work Worsens Crisis [PRAVDA 20 Apr] ..... | 28 |
| CPSU Nationalities Commission Meets [TASS] .....                     | 28 |
| Ivashko Meets With Government Communists [PRAVDA 18 Apr] .....       | 29 |

|                                                                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Dzasokhov Says Party Under Great Tension [Moscow International]                        | 29 |
| Gorbachev Said To Lack Lukyanov Support [Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 19 Apr] | 29 |
| Arguments for Gorbachev Ouster Criticized [PRAVDA 23 Apr]                              | 29 |
| TASS Reviews Central Press for 24 Apr                                                  | 32 |
| Yakovlev Warns of Civil War Danger [Berlin ADN]                                        | 32 |
| Perestroika Roundtable Speakers 'Radical' [PRAVDA 22 Apr]                              | 33 |
| IZVESTIYA on Perestroika Roundtable [23 Apr]                                           | 33 |
| Trade Union Body Calls Off Warning Strike [Moscow Radio]                               | 35 |
| Sverdlovsk Plant Takes Poll on Party Committees [TASS]                                 | 35 |
| Sverdlovsk Situation Termed 'Critical' [IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]                              | 35 |
| Official Denies Prison Camp Restoration [Moscow Radio]                                 | 36 |
| Blockades Trap Rail Freight in Krasnodar [PRAVDA 18 Apr]                               | 36 |
| Success Claimed for Joint Patrolling [Moscow Radio]                                    | 36 |

#### Economic

|                                                                     |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Gorbachev, Presidents Adopt Anticrisis Measures [PRAVDA 24 Apr]     | 37 |
| Jan-Mar Economic Performance Surveyed [IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]            | 38 |
| Vorkuta Rally Fails To Back Strike Call [PRAVDA 20 Apr]             | 41 |
| Cooperatives Union To Support Miners' Strike [Moscow International] | 41 |

#### REGIONAL AFFAIRS

##### Baltic Republics

|                                                                          |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Estonian Supreme Soviet Amends Labor Law [TASS]                          | 42 |
| Latvia Not Planning Independence Steps [TASS]                            | 42 |
| Pavlov, Latvian Premier View Economic Relations [Riga Radio]             | 42 |
| Report Cites Gorbunovs Interview [IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]                      | 42 |
| Latvian Communist Party's Rubiks Interviewed [PRAVDA 12 Apr]             | 43 |
| Lithuania's Landsbergis Appeals to Gorbachev [Radio Rossii]              | 45 |
| Lithuanian School Seized, Landsbergis Reacts [EKHO LITVY 11 Apr]         | 45 |
| Lithuania Approves Privatization Commission [Radio Vilnius]              | 46 |
| Vagnorius Discusses Privatization, Economy [EKHO LITVY 12 Apr]           | 46 |
| Lithuania 'Imposing' Citizenship on Russians [PRAVDA 17 Apr]             | 46 |
| Lithuanian Faction Statement Supports Government [Vilnius International] | 47 |
| Lithuania Not To Permit Dual Citizenship [IZVESTIYA 19 Apr]              | 48 |
| Vilnius Notes Union Protest to FRG on Visit [Radio Vilnius]              | 48 |

##### RSFSR

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Vorkuta Strikers Cable Demands to Pavlov [Radio Rossii]           | 48 |
| 'All-Russia Warning Action' Set for 26 Apr [Moscow TV]            | 48 |
| Silayev Discusses Talks in Washington [TASS]                      | 48 |
| Russian Deputies Say Land Reform Making Progress [Moscow TV]      | 49 |
| Legislature Discusses Privatization Bills [TASS]                  | 49 |
| Moscow Establishes Labor Solidarity Fund [Moscow Radio]           | 50 |
| Meeting Considers North Ossetia Clashes [Moscow Radio]            | 50 |
| RSFSR Constitutional Changes Assailed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Apr] | 50 |
| 'Communist Initiative Movement' Congress Ends [PRAVDA 22 Apr]     | 52 |
| National-Patriots Movements Seeks Return to Past [TASS]           | 52 |

##### Western Republics

|                                                             |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Protest Rally Continues in Minsk 23 Apr [Moscow TV]         | 53 |
| New Demands Issued [TASS]                                   | 53 |
| Demands 'Strictly Political' [Radio Rossii]                 | 53 |
| Thirteen Strike Committees Join [Minsk Radio]               | 54 |
| Ukrainian Law Adopted on Freedom of Conscience [TASS]       | 54 |
| Kravchuk Receives Hungarian Delegation [Kiev International] | 55 |

|                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Kravchuk Meets Von Weizsacker, Genscher in Bonn [TASS] .....                | 55 |
| Ukraine Official Says Borders 'Inviolable' [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA 4 Apr] ..... | 55 |
| Moldovans Welcome Party 'Stabilization' Proposals [Moscow Radio] .....      | 57 |

**Caucasus**

|                                                                              |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Gorbachev Signs Decree on Armenian Legislation [Moscow Radio] .....          | 57 |
| Armenian Communists Oppose Property Nationalization [IZVESTIYA 23 Apr] ..... | 58 |
| Nagorno-Kharabakh Town Shelled, Three Wounded [TASS] .....                   | 58 |
| Commission Blames Railroad Attacks on Armenia [TASS] .....                   | 58 |
| Armenian, Azerbaijani Officials Hold Talks [Baku Radio] .....                | 58 |
| MVD Troops Confiscate Arms in South Ossetia [TASS] .....                     | 58 |
| Georgians Denounce New Tskhinvali Procurator [Tbilisi Radio] .....           | 59 |
| Georgia President Proposes Referendum for Ossetians [TASS] .....             | 59 |
| Georgian Foreign Minister Holds News Conference [TASS] .....                 | 59 |
| Georgia Adopts Prefecture Law [Moscow Radio] .....                           | 60 |

**TASS Reports Ignatenko Briefing 23 Apr**

*LD2304153991 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT  
23 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Konstantin Voytsekhovich, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev expects the Communist Party Central Committee plenum, opening in Moscow on Wednesday, to conduct a "very serious, constructive and straightforward discussion" of current difficulties, his press secretary said today.

Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here that the agenda for the plenum includes two issues. Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov will deliver a report on the first one—the situation in the country and ways to pull the economy out of the crisis; and Central Committee Secretary Valentin Kuptsov will deliver a report on the second issue—communists' work in governing councils.

Gorbachev will make a speech on economic matters, according to his press secretary.

At the time of the briefing, Gorbachev was meeting with the leaders of nine republics willing to sign a new federal treaty, Ignatenko said. The meeting, at Novoye Ogarevo outside Moscow, was discussing a treaty draft, economic problems and other current issues. Russia was represented by Boris Yeltsin.

Commenting on French President Francois Mitterrand's visit to the USSR on May 6, Ignatenko said it will focus on "serious issues" that have piled up since the last Soviet-French summit, including European security, the postwar situation in the Gulf, and bilateral relations.

Asked about last Sunday's convention of the Soyuz parliamentary faction, which demanded a special congress of people's deputies to hear an account by President Gorbachev, Ignatenko said that such a legislative session "would be untimely and hardly instrumental to progress".

He noted disagreements inside the faction, with some members having already objected publicly to the convention's decisions and procedures whereby they had been adopted.

Commenting on the possibility of declaring a state of emergency in the Soviet Union, Ignatenko said Gorbachev "is not inclined to resort to such measures". In any case, such decisions are not taken by the president individually, he added.

Commenting on next Thursday's meeting in Kislovodsk between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, Ignatenko said no changes are foreseen in joint plans to hold a

Soviet-U.S. summit in the first half of the year. The precise date will be agreed upon "more specifically through diplomatic channels", the press secretary said.

He said that Gorbachev plans to report on his visits to Japan and South Korea to parliament.

**TASS Reports Churkin Briefing 23 Apr**

*LD2304153591 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT  
23 Apr 91*

[By TASS Diplomatic Correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—A working meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will take place in Kislovodsk, northern Caucasus, on April 25, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said today.

The meeting is expected to focus on a political settlement in the Middle East and in the Gulf and also on some other issues "of mutual interest".

Asked if the date of a Soviet-U.S. summit, which is planned for the first half of this year, will be announced in Kislovodsk, Churkin did not rule out that this issue "will be taken in some or other form". However, "It will be not the key issue", according to Churkin.

On Soviet observers' participation in the activity of a U.N. observer unit on the Iraq-Kuwait border, Churkin said that the head of the Soviet observer team was already in the area of deployment. The rest of the team—19 people—will fly to the place on April 24.

Churkin also informed journalists that Soviet ambassador to Kuwait Ernst Zverev would go to Kuwait on April 27.

Churkin touched on the results of the meeting of the commission on security in Central America held in Managua recently. In keeping with the agenda, all delegations were expected to present inventory documents containing detailed information about troop strength and the amount of armaments in their countries, but only Nicaragua and Costa Rica submitted them. In this regard, it was decided to hold a new meeting in Guatemala on June 10.

Participants "have so far failed" to accomplish in full the task set before them, Churkin said. It is perfectly obvious that conflicts in Central America contain the implementation of measures for disarmament in the region. If a serious breakthrough is achieved at talks on a peace settlement in El Salvador, more favourable conditions would be created for implementing regional countries' plans to reduce troops and armaments.

The Soviet side welcomes a vigorous quest by Central American states of ways towards real disarmament and

believes that this activity coupled with efforts to tackle socio-economic problems will help to the region move more rapidly towards peace, democracy and security, Churkin said.

**Amnesty International Cited on Improved Rights**

*PM2404104991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*

*16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Times Are Changing"]

[Text] London, 15 Apr—"The Soviet Union has become more open and democratic country today," Nicola Duckworth, an expert from the nongovernmental organization Amnesty International, which fights for observance of human rights, said in an interview with TASS.

"We welcome the fact that the human rights situation in your country has improved considerably. Soviet people now have the opportunity to freely voice their opinion on government policy. New political parties have been set up and an independent press has emerged. The fact that Soviet people have obtained freedom of religion is also significant."

## United States & Canada

### Bessmertnykh, Baker To Meet in Caucasus 25 Apr

LD2304142191 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1340 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—A working meeting is to take place in Kislovodsk (northern Caucasus) on 25 April, between USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. Vitaliy Churkin, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Department, announced this at a briefing today.

During the meeting it is proposed to discuss problems connected with a political settlement in the Near East and the Persian Gulf and also a number of other issues "of mutual interest."

In answer to a question as to whether a date will be set in Kislovodsk for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which is known to be planned for the first half of this year, Vitaliy Churkin did not exclude the possibility that this matter "would be touched upon in one form or another." However, he said, "this will not be the main thing".

"I think it would be too much to expect that a definite date for the meeting will be set in Kislovodsk," the Soviet diplomat declared "We are not setting ourselves such a task."

### Baker's Mideast Tour Reviewed

LD2304185891 Moscow International Service in Arabic  
1600 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Oleg Ribkov commentary]

[Text] The U.S. secretary of state is continuing his tour of the Middle East. Today in Jeddah he met with Saudi Foreign Minister Sa'ud al-Faysal. Before that he held lengthy talks with King Fahd.

Observers in the region note that the visit to Saudi Arabia is a very important part of Baker's tour for promoting the idea of the proposed regional conference. This in its turn is the principal objective of Baker's third visit to the Middle East in recent times.

Riyadh's position carries considerable weight in the region. Therefore we can undoubtedly consider that King Fahd's wish for Baker's mission to succeed is a positive point for the U.S. secretary of state.

I considered that until the beginning of this mission the principal obstacle to holding the conference would be the issue of Palestinian representation. However, to date there is an impression that Baker was able to ease the severity of the inevitable clash on this issue between the Israeli position and the position of the majority of the

Arab countries. So far the PLO, Egypt, and Jordan have shown flexibility on the forms of representation and ("restricted") the participants to the countries which were not directly involved in the conflict. [sentence as heard]

Baker's visit to Damascus is the sensitive point in his tour. So far Syria has insisted on holding a conference on the Middle East under UN auspices. However, Israel has categorically rejected this condition. It is assumed that Baker will try to convince the Syrian leadership not to reject that form of the conference in which international participation will be secured through the presence of the Soviet and U.S. representatives, and maybe representatives of the EEC. By the way, the Europeans insist on participating in the conference.

Until recently Israel opposed this form, but not as categorically as it opposed the international conference under UN auspices. It seems that the United States hopes to smooth Tel Aviv's position by giving guarantees which will remove the compulsory nature from the resolutions of the international conference. Anyway, Israeli Foreign Minister David Levy has announced that the United States is ready to give guarantees, even in writing.

Now we must understand that the principal obstacle is represented by the following question: Is Israel ready to accept the conditions proposed to it? Or will it, as before, insist on the direct participation of only the concerned sides in the conference? Should the conference merely be ceremonial prior to the start of the direct negotiations between Israel and all the Arab countries individually?

Baker said in Cairo yesterday: The Israeli Government has time to think. However, it has been officially announced in Jerusalem that Baker will return to Israel on 24 April. Therefore the thinking time is limited. It seems that the key to the conference hall is now in the hands of the Israelis. Do they want to use it?

## Northeast Asia

### PRAVDA Assesses Tokyo Summit Outcome

#### Japan 'Has Become Much Closer'

PM2304145191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
20 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1,6

[Report by special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and I. Latyshev: "It Has Become Much Closer"]

[Text] Tokyo, 19 Apr—Of course, they will always remember it—the president, the officials accompanying him, and the journalists covering the first visit by a Soviet leader to the Land of the Rising Sun. But they are not the impressions newspapermen like to adorn their reports with, particularly when they find themselves in exotic countries. So let's not have the reader complaining to us about this.

Until today neither the president himself nor those who came here with him had any opportunity even to acquaint themselves with the Japanese capital. Through the window of the car traveling from the airport you could see, like the swift sequence of frames in a silent movie, the Tokyo streets dressed in the pink and white kimono of the Japanese flowering cherry and on the streets the ultramodern skyscrapers which seem to be at odds with traditional ways... We were captives, in the fashionable New Otani Hotel, which had been cordoned off by the police. The delegation's headquarters was there, together with the major information departments. It was there too that the main meetings with the Japanese side, in which M.S. Gorbachev participated, and other functions were held. And the president, as he himself joked, spent the days largely "under political arrest," that is, at the negotiating table. He had in all, if one takes the breaks into account, eight conversations with Japanese prime minister T. Kaifu, lasting a total of 12 hours. As Mikhail Sergeyevich said, that should go down in the Guinness Book of Records.

But this was the "exotic" political element, if you like, of the visit, its inner drama. There was too much they had to say to one another, there was too much to be understood, and there were too many "fateful decisions," as we are fond of saying today, to be made. They were the most highly charged and difficult talks our president has had with a foreign leader in recent years. Sometimes it seemed, and the president frankly confided this to the PRAVDA correspondents, that they were going nowhere, that a solution would not be found, and that the burden of the past would prevent Soviet-Japanese relations from being raised to a new level. This was primarily due to the Japanese side's fixation about the territorial issue.

Efforts to make the future of Soviet-Japanese relations and the very signing of a peace treaty between our countries hinge on this single issue were daily and hourly egged on by the local media on the threshold of the Soviet president's visit.

By the start of the talks passions were at the boiling point, which, of course, was bound to affect Prime Minister T. Kaifu's initial stance. Local analysts aired all manner of "scenarios." The transfer of two islands, in accordance with the 1956 promise, the "acknowledgment of sovereignty over all four islands," and even essentially immoral variations on a trade deal: the sale of the islands to Japan (here the figure of \$28 billion was named; a figure of as much as 200 billion is cited in the Soviet Union). Unfortunately, this mood has also had an impact on our country. It has provoked certain unfounded accusations against the president, who allegedly intended to trade the territory.

Everything was sorted out when, although this sounds pretty banal, common sense prevailed. It says that before such highly complex and, to be frank, painful issues are actually decided, mutual relations must be radically improved. In our view, what Japanese diplomacy was

intending to do was to start from the end. But one had to start from the beginning: first of all create an atmosphere of mutual trust and wide-ranging cooperation, wherein the most controversial questions would acquire a different significance and new ways of settling them would open up.

That is why one attaches such importance to the group of concepts that appeared in the joint statement as a result of the summit talks: A peace treaty between Japan and the USSR should be a document of final postwar settlement, including the resolution of the territorial issue, and it should offer a long-term future for Japanese-Soviet relations on a friendly basis and rule out anything that might be prejudicial to the other side's security.

As for the actual territorial issue, placed by Japan at the top of the agenda, one might say that as a result of the talks it was viewed from the position of today's political realities. The Soviet side displayed respect for the Japanese people and an appreciation of its feelings.

What was it like before, in fact? It was very simple, M.S. Gorbachev told journalists. All talks with the Japanese side, he added, used to take a few minutes. Question: What is the first question?—the territorial issue. Answer: There is no issue as far as we are concerned. Question number two? But there was no question number two; that was that...

Now the Soviet-Japanese joint statement records in black and white, for the first time, that the range of questions relating to the elaboration of a peace treaty between Japan and the USSR includes the issue of territorial demarcation, taking into account the sides' positions on who the Habomai islands, the island of Shikotan, the island of Kunashir, and the island of Iturup belong to.

Prime Minister T. Kaifu and the other Liberal Democratic Party leaders saw this as a "significant step forward." Well, as they say in the East, "the longest journey begins with the first step."

Many other politicians and public figures have made similar statements. The Japanese Democratic Socialist Party leadership, for example, made a positive statement, stressing the need to comprehensively expand large-scale economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Incidentally, the only political party in the country to express a negative view of the joint statement was the Japan Communist Party, whose leadership was obviously unable to overcome the desire that is ingrained in many opposition politicians to reject out of hand all decisions taken by a government of their political opponents.

The spread of opinion is wide here at the moment. Painstaking Japanese commentators are comprehensively and meticulously analyzing literally every line of the joint statement and every phrase uttered by the USSR president at the press conference. And what they

(many of them, anyway) are doing is useful. If only because the Japanese public, like our people, must have a clear picture of the major changes for the better in Soviet-Japanese relations that have taken place as a result of the USSR president's visit. There have been negative pronouncements, of course. Some Tokyo papers, for example, express regret that as a result of the talks the Japanese side did not secure territorial concessions from the USSR (two or even four islands of the southern part of the Kuril chain). For example, the paper SANKEI SHIMBUN advocates a tougher approach to the Soviet Union, which allegedly would bring Japan some benefits in the present situation. Evidently, some people here intend to continue to fight rearguard actions. But sober assessments of the prospects for the development of Soviet-Japanese relations are clearly more in evidence. Significant in this respect is an editorial article in the paper ASAHI—one of the most influential in the country. It unequivocally stresses the need for Japan to abandon the policy of curbing its economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and pressuring it on territorial issues. "The only way to solve the territorial question is to bring about a general improvement in relations between the two countries," the paper notes.

If one is talking about a "journey" into a joint future, then the president's visit imparted powerful momentum to Soviet-Japanese economic cooperation. You have not only Japanese involvement in the development of Siberia and the Far East, but also new forms of cooperation—joint ventures, assistance in the establishment of an infrastructure for our market, a management structure, and the involvement of Japanese banks, which are currently among the biggest in the world.

One may ask: But where is the money? Why did the president not bring back new credits running into billions? Let us face it, there are plenty of people here who are fond of such questions. Well, first we have to put our own house in order, stop the "war of laws," and halt the disintegration of union economic links, and then credits will be needed and will be of some use. Incidentally, we will then be able to obtain them as well. At the moment, they could all end up in the bottomless pit of expenditure no one understands.

We are not going to list all the agreements signed yesterday—the main thing is that, put together, they establish a sound basis for the further development and expansion of businesslike and good-neighborly links between the two countries.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan was far more than an exercise in bilateral relations. Two aspects have to be mentioned here. In the first place, Japan is now associated, as it were, with the global process of creating a new world order. The one-sided orientation toward the United States was a drag on Japanese diplomacy's international activity. Now this economic giant is beginning to acquire its due political authority in the international arena. Second, new prospects are opening up for the USSR and Japan for combined efforts to strengthen

peace and prosperity in the Asian-Pacific region. Such a partnership, involving the USSR, the United States, India, China, Japan, and other states in the region, would hoist the Asian-Pacific region up to the level that has already been reached by European security. M.S. Gorbachev expressed here a number of concrete proposals on strengthening security in this region. They all aroused interest and they are being widely discussed by local observers.

So the USSR president's visit to Japan has ended. Its results will be discussed for a long time yet in the press and among political leaders the world over. We will be examining them too. But it is clear now that there has been a breakthrough. One of the last citadels left after World War II and the cold war that followed it has cracked wide open.

There is no denying that Japan, although a neighbor, has always been remote from us. But, as tends to happen: No doubt the president himself and those who came with him for several days will leave the country, which actually they did not even see, with the feeling that it has become much closer.

#### **'Breakthrough Not Achieved'**

PM2304083791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[*"Editorial Office Commentary": "Breakthrough Not Achieved?"*]

[Text] This word, which appeared so frequently in politicians' statements on the eve of the USSR president's visit to the Land of the Rising Sun, did not, alas, find a place in the joint statement signed on the results of the visit. Even though both sides rated highly the results of the meetings and talks, you get the feeling that they are not entirely satisfied. But was it really possible to hope for a breakthrough in bilateral relations? What did the two sides mean by this word? With the help of what means and decisions did they want to achieve it?

When preparing for the meetings and talks in Tokyo people both in the USSR and in Japan realized that a breakthrough could be achieved only by means of major mutual concessions, compromises, and decisions in the political and economic spheres. At the same time each side vested this figurative expression with its own meaning and its own understanding, built its plans, above all, on the attainment of its own advantages, and was guided by its own designs.

Japan proceeded from the premise that the USSR would yield in one way or another to its insistent territorial demands. In this it was guided by the following considerations. First, the USSR would take account of the fact that "the return of the northern territories" is "the ardent desire of the majority of the Japanese people." Second, Tokyo believed that Moscow would make concessions in the hope of rectifying, in exchange for them,

the grave internal economic situation in the country thanks to Japan's mighty industrial and financial potential.

The Soviet Union really wants this potential to work for our economy on mutually advantageous terms. But at the same time it has by no means contemplated territorial concessions. However great "the desire of the entire Japanese people" to see the islands under their jurisdiction, the documents packed into the Soviet president's attache case for the Tokyo talks included the results of a poll among the inhabitants of the South Kuril islands. And these also encapsulated—as is also evidenced by PRAVDA's mail—the opinion of the Soviet Union. This opinion is against the transfer of the "northern territories" to Japan. Could the Soviet leader really have ignored this fact? For he had declared in Khabarovsk: I will do as you, the people, have said.

The Soviet side's calculations were built on securing Japan's economic assistance, but not in exchange for territorial concessions. We are taking the path of recognizing and supporting the political role of the Land of the Rising Sun in the modern world, in which tremendous changes are occurring under the impact of the new political thinking. In a world in which the new order will be built not on confrontation between the two superpowers but on cooperation and mutual understanding among, in particular, four such centers—the United States, the USSR, West Europe, and Japan.

This is the difference in calculations and in approaches to the new realities. Each of the participants in the Tokyo talks and meetings had its own idea of what lay behind the figurative expression "breakthrough."

True, a breakthrough did not happen. But, on the other hand, the two sides are now well aware how to achieve one. And this is the success of the meeting. The joint statement and the bulky package of treaties and agreements laid a good foundation for knowing and understanding each other better and more deeply and widely and for attaining a new round in not only bilateral but also international relations.

The result of the Tokyo meetings and talks attest that, despite the difference in the partners' "characters," they nevertheless realize that they need one another and, in addition, they better understand that politics and economics complement and influence each other.

Preconditions have been laid down to change the situation and the atmosphere and to create a different level of trust, and this will ensure success not in the narrow sector of which the sides spoke but over a wide front and, above all, in the political and economic areas of cooperation.

## IZVESTIYA Views Outcome of Japan Visit

PM1904183591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
20 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[Special correspondents S. Agafonov and S. Kondrashov report: "Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained"]

[Text] Tokyo—The joint statement on the results of the USSR president's visit to Japan was signed at 2345 hours 18 April, eight hours "later than scheduled"—an eight-hour period that was taken up by unplanned talks devoted virtually in their entirety to the territorial question. To be more accurate, to haggling over the wording used to reflect this issue in the final document. It has now become a diplomatic fact and an undoubted milestone in Moscow's and Tokyo's difficult and sometimes still slow movement to accommodate one another.

Gorbachev said later, at his press conference after midnight, that he had not had such talks for a long time and the experienced corps of journalists believed him since the Soviet leader did indeed look tired. The strain imposed by "mad Thursday"—as the last day has been dubbed—was in fact colossal. It appeared, from an onlooker's viewpoint, not only to demolish the carefully prepared program for the visit, but also all reserves of patience. However, there was, we were told, some kind of realization uniting both delegations around the negotiating table that exhausting debates over every word and sentence were inevitable. This somehow made up for the decades in which there had been no top-level dialogue.

The president acknowledged that more than 80 percent of the time spent in the Akasaka Palace negotiating hall was used to discuss problems linked with the conclusion of a peace treaty—problems which the Japanese reduced to a single problem, the territorial problem. This marathon culminated in the refined wording of the fourth point of the joint statement, which all the press here are now interpreting, weighing up every word and even the order of words in a sentence so as to ascertain who made more concessions to whom. We think that a "verbatim translation" of the signed document is far more essential and important. In effect, a ceremony has taken place in Tokyo over the last three days to lay the "foundation of a new house," the final design of which has not yet been agreed. Everyone realizes that it is necessary to start with the groundwork, but it is still not clear how many stories are to be erected and how, although it is quite obvious that the incipient construction must not be abandoned.

In our view, the main result of the visit is that the entire set of bilateral relations, including the question of territorial demarcation, have been extricated from capital stagnation to a state of onward development.

Many Japanese figures and mass media are not hiding their disappointment, since the great expectations and hopes of a Japanese triumph failed to be realized. However, this is built-in disappointment, since the Soviet side gave them no cause to harbor illusions and Gorbachev should hardly be blamed for failing to bring

the Japanese territorial souvenirs that he had not promised. Gorbachev brought something else—prospects. And in addition, ideas on how to realize these prospects.

We think that the Japanese side at the current stage was somewhat carried away by tactical considerations, yielding to the temptation of "squeezing" their partner. The Soviet side, on the contrary, proposed a more complex scheme guided by strategic considerations. The upshot was that there was none of the "political bartering" that many people had expected, but there was a more stable, promising coupling that committed the sides to taking further steps. This does not mean that the Soviet side "played" the Japanese side along—their approaches were too different. It was just that a qualitatively different situation arose in their relations, which the Soviet president described as the prologue to possible future breakthroughs [proryv].

It was from this viewpoint that the attempts by several local newspapers to depict the summit meeting as a failure quite rapidly revealed their untenability, giving way to a broader approach than a primitive investigation of options for the hypothetical solution of the territorial question.

One "simple truism" relating to the results of the summit talks is that miraculous changes do not take place in the delicate business of interstate relations. It was easier for the ancients—they severed Gordian knots, crossed Rubicons, fought battles, and then looked at the situation, and so on and so forth. Today, in our highly complex world, one may of course harbor nostalgic memories of these models of determination but one should not rely on and put one's trust in them. A modern politician must be more circumspect and flexible since he is handicapped by previously unknown political responsibility. The extent of this responsibility indicates the level of the politician.

After signing the joint statement, our president and the Japanese prime minister swapped pens according to established tradition, exchanged handshakes, and then performed a hitherto unknown ceremony: Gorbachev and Kaifu extended the little fingers of their right hands to one another, clasping them in a symbolic gesture with which everyone is familiar from childhood—"Pax, Pax, and no more scraps..." The stupefaction of the officials present rapidly gave way to smiles and relieved laughter, which not only cleared the air at the ceremony but also, as it were, closed the gap between the two sides...

#### **Gorbachev Interviewed on Relations With Japan** LD2104141791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1215 GMT on 20 April broadcasts a five-minute documentary entitled "At the approaches to El Dorado" in which IZVESTIYA correspondents Sergey Agafonov and Boris Reznik reflect on the past, present, and future of Soviet-Japanese relations.

The program shows video clips of Japanese life and pictures illustrating the history of contacts between these two very different countries. They include scenes of war, the lessons of which were not learned, Reznik says. The two correspondents then go on to talk about Japanese life and the Japanese peoples' thoughts about the USSR.

This is followed by a three-minute interview with USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. No details are given of when and where the interview took place. Gorbachev says: "Our relations no doubt require rethinking, both on our part and also, I am sure, on the part of Japan. Moreover, I believe this process of rethinking has already begun. What served as an impetus to this process was the agreement that in the spring of this year, the USSR president would pay a visit to Japan.

"No doubt we are witnessing the way the world is passing from the era of cold war into another era—that of prolonged and peaceful cooperation. I must say that all countries have been making whatever contribution they can. I must say that Japan is contributing its share into this very important and deep process. It seems somewhat anachronistic that our relations have fallen behind this turbulent process of changes and renewal which is under way in the world.

"I think that both in the USSR and in Japan we have realized this fact. I am certain, I am optimistic, and I can see that the very preparation of the visit will enable us to switch our relations to another level. Let us make albeit the first, nevertheless I think, major important moves in the framework of this visit. Japan is our neighbor, and from this viewpoint the very first rule and requirement resulting from this situation is that we must build an especially active—[changes thought] conduct affairs and cooperation jointly and actively. I think that does not yet exist. Both the USSR and Japan stand to lose from this.

"I believe both we and Japan have proved—and proved successfully—that we can live without one another. We have coped with that task. However, I do not think that either of us has gained anything from that.

"Now we must prove that we need one another and that we can cooperate successfully. I think our peoples are interested in this and show their interest. At any rate, speaking about this I base myself on our public opinion within the USSR. Our people are in favor of cooperation with Japan. Therefore, I have great plans and I am pinning great hopes on this visit. I hope that a considerable part of them will be realized, although it may be that not all will. At any rate, I am optimistic with regard to the way in which the Japanese are acting and cooperating with us."

#### **Eduard Shevardnadze Comments on Tokyo Talks** PM1904141991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PR11DA in Russian 19 Apr 91 p 3

[I. Kadulin report: "Evening Call to Eduard Shevardnadze"]

[Text] Although USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan is still continuing, certain Western observers are already affirming that instead of the previously expected concrete proposals, Gorbachev has merely brought with him some drafts of general agreements.

We called Eduard Shevardnadze, former USSR foreign minister and currently president of the Foreign Policy Association, and asked him to comment on the preliminary results of the visit.

[Shevardnadze] Even two months back, answering a question put by Japanese correspondents on the possible results of this meeting, I told them the following: We must not expect revolutionary changes in bilateral relations. I believe that since 1985 a dialogue has developed between the two sides in which, on the whole, enormous progress has been made. But given the complex internal political situation in the country, it was difficult to expect anything major.

[Kadulin] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, the viewpoint exists that the Soviet-Japanese dialogue will also affect relations between the USSR and the United States.

[Shevardnadze] I do not share this viewpoint. Obviously there are certain contradictions between the United States and Japan. But I believe that the president's visit to Japan will not have a serious effect on Soviet-U.S. relations. And the USSR's relations with the United States and Japan depend directly on our internal political situation. If we manage to stabilize it, then our relations with the outside world will progress. If we do not, however, the consequences may be unpredictable, and this will straightaway bring about a reduction in stability in the world.

[Kadulin] All the same, Eduard Amvrosiyevich, what impression do you have of the talks in Tokyo?

[Shevardnadze] The conditions are not yet suitable for cardinal changes, but looking at the real possibilities, without euphoria, you can talk about positive results.

[Kadulin] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, does it not seem strange to you that, aside from Gorbachev, almost all the country's top leaders have simultaneously gone off to visit different countries?

[Shevardnadze] This is either a fortuitous misunderstanding or an underestimation of the great seriousness of the situation in the country.

### Observer Ponders Asian Security Questions

PM2204161591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA  
in Russian 19 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[Observer Aleksandr Golts article under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Views": "Asia: Restocking the Potential of Trust"]

[Text] So, contrary to the assumptions of many experts, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev did not advance any major initiatives in Tokyo in the sphere of ensuring security in the Asia and Pacific region. However, does this mean that Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH is mistaken in its assumption that a new era of detente is coming in Asia? I think not. Addressing not only legislators but also the entire people of Japan in his speech to the Japanese Parliament, the Soviet president revealed the significance of our military doctrine, whose exclusively defensive nature extends also to the "eastern salient." He described in detail how, in accordance with its pledges, our country is eliminating nuclear missile weapons and reducing other arms. An important place in this speech was devoted also to the reduction of the grouping of Soviet troops in the east of the country by 200,000 servicemen and the reduction of the Soviet military presence in the Asia and Pacific region.

I believe that it was very important to draw the attention precisely of the Japanese public to these actions by the USSR. For people in that country had for decades been stubbornly going on about the Soviet military threat. And politicians there still consider it possible to talk of some "Soviet troop buildup east of the Urals."

But it was no coincidence that M.S. Gorbachev pointed out that far more would have been done in the matter of disarmament if other powers had responded to the Soviet Union's proposals. Unfortunately, it has to be stated that not all our partners realized that security must not be divided into time zones. And the principles by which the new security is being established on the European continent may be applied to resolving analogous tasks in the Asia and Pacific region. However, the considerable superiority which the United States and its allies possess in the Pacific prevents them from taking an unbiased view of the measures of military detente and military trust which have already been approved in Europe and which can perfectly well be realized in Asia.

"Regardless of what happens in the Kremlin, the well-armed Soviets remain a potential threat to Japan's security," U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary D. Atwood says, intimidating Tokyo. And literally on the eve of the Soviet president's arrival the newspaper MAINICHI reported: According to a spokesman for the Japanese military department, any program proposed by the Soviet president to ensure security in the region "would be unacceptable, regardless of its substance." Note, "regardless of its substance"!

Thus we can only rejoice at the fact that we have abandoned the ostentatious practice of advancing new initiatives regardless of the real situation. After all, a principled program for the restructuring of relations in Asia was formulated in Vladivostok five years ago. Be that as it may, this program is being realized, albeit with difficulty. The USSR and the United States have declared that they do not regard each other as enemies in the Asia and Pacific region either. Soviet-Chinese relations have also been normalized. At the same time the

USSR and China were the first in Asia to take practical steps for the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in the border region.

Finally, M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan is one more step in the realization of the Vladivostok program. So the fact that the Soviet proposals on military detente have still not been taken up should hardly be dramatized. This certainly does not mean that they are bad and need to be modified. It is simply that the time to realize them has not yet come.

In this connection note should also be taken of the rather complex situation in which Asian and Pacific states find themselves after the end of the war in the Persian Gulf. The point is that this war has very badly shaken the idea, which had only just begun to get established, that security and prosperity can be guaranteed not only and not so much with the help of military force as with the help of mutual trust and mutual control. An idea, I will point out, which was taking root far more slowly in Asia—a continent where there are constant military conflicts—than in Europe.

All the more so because the United States—a country which has an obvious military superiority in the Pacific—now aspires quite frankly to becoming the sole guarantor of security in that region. Washington declares that the time has come to establish a new order in the world and in Asia. "The United States has, incontestably, received the unofficial title of world policeman," Philippine Foreign Minister R. Manglapus states. "There are people who maintain that, if such a policeman did not exist, he would have to be invented." However, far from everyone shares this viewpoint. "Bush's call for the introduction of a new world order will mean the establishment of U.S. supremacy," Dr. N. Prudente, rector of a polytechnical institute in Manila, declares in alarm.

In fact, it would be naive in the extreme to believe that Washington would selflessly guard the peace and security of countries, of a rapidly developing economic region. A region which is already a serious rival of the United States on this plane.

Japan, an ally and rival of Washington, has already felt that the cost of U.S. protection certainly is not confined to the billions which it allocated to the anti-Iraq coalition and which it allocates annually for the upkeep of thousands of U.S. servicemen on its territory. Taking advantage of the events in the Gulf and accusing Japan of being passive, Washington bluntly demanded of Tokyo economic concessions which, so it seems, will be made in the present situation. So there are no guarantees that the United States will not present other Asian countries too with a bill for "ensuring security."

There is another solution—also no better, in my view. Namely: to build up the military might of Asian countries themselves. This option is particularly tempting for Japan with its huge economic potential, part of which it would not be that hard to put on a military footing. The

Pentagon has just concluded a contract with a U.S.-Japanese consortium to conduct "conceptual research work" on the deployment of SDI programs in the West Pacific. And the consortium is headed by the Japanese industrial giant Mitsubishi.

At the same time many people in Tokyo are saying that military might is certainly not needed now for defense against the "Soviet military threat," in which people there do not seem to have too much faith. No, might is needed today, rather, for their own feeling of independence. And I believe that it was not without prompting from his partners in the talks that Philippine Defense Minister F. Ramos, who was visiting Tokyo, started talking of the need for Japan to play a more significant military role in Asia.

People are thinking of this not only in Tokyo. The recent unprecedented contract from South Korea, which ordered 120 F-16 fighter-bombers at once from the United States, is merely the first sign of purchases of this kind. Even though it is possible that Asian states will appreciate such an error, the path of ensuring security with the help of either one's own or someone else's military force cannot be considered promising.

No, the states of the region are not ready to create a collective security system today. But this is no reason to abandon the search for paths to security. It is necessary to develop relations of mutual trust on a bilateral basis. And this is an inevitable and positive stage in the process which will lead also to a multilateral examination of problems both of the economy and of security. At the same time the Soviet Union is not yet talking of creating multilateral cooperation mechanisms. It is a question of consultations, including with a wide range of participants, of the joint ascertainment and discussion of problems in common, and of the timely comprehension of dangers in common.

It was in just this sense that M.S. Gorbachev spoke of the expediency of a five-way conference of the USSR, the United States, the PRC, India, and Japan. Just such consultative meaning is also vested in the Soviet proposal to hold a meeting of the foreign ministers of all the countries of the Asia and Pacific region in 1993.

Strictly speaking, M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan has demonstrated how such bilateral ties may be built. For not only questions of Soviet-Japanese relations were touched on in the top-level talks. Attention was focused on problems of settling regional conflicts, particularly in Cambodia and on the Korean Peninsula. Constructive proposals have been advanced recently in Japan on precisely these problems.

Finally, as regards the military sphere, here too the Soviet Union is ready to begin a specific dialogue in order to eliminate mutual concerns. Proposals in this regard have already been forwarded to the Japanese Government.

Well, M.S. Gorbachev's visit has demonstrated that detente in Asia is real and possible. But the potential of mutual trust has to be accumulated patiently.

#### **TASS on Developing Ties With ROK**

*LD2204174491 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT  
22 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo April 22 TASS—The first ever visit to the Republic of Korea by a Soviet leader will give a strong impetus to the development of bilateral relations, said South Korean Prime Minister No Chae-pong at the National Assembly (parliament). Similar thoughts were expressed at today's cabinet meeting, presided over by President No Tae-u, which summed up the results of the Soviet-South Korean summit talks.

The prime minister said that the government will take all necessary measures to ensure that the meeting between the presidents of the USSR and South Korea bears fruit and promotes peace and stability in the region. He said No Tae-u advised the foreign minister to discuss Gorbachev's proposal for drafting and signing a bilateral treaty of goodneighbourliness and cooperation at the next meeting with his Soviet counterpart.

South Korea will thoroughly study the Soviet proposal for a treaty, foreign minister Yi Sang-ok told the cabinet meeting. He said the cabinet will closely study similar treaties that the USSR has with other countries. The cabinet will also consult with allies. Yi Sang-ok leaves on a tour of Japan and the United States on Wednesday.

The cabinet also supported all plans for deepening economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and South Korea, including projects to develop Sakhalin and Siberia jointly, Yi Sang-ok said. The South Korean leadership has already started drafting a complex of specific measures.

The economic planning agency, the ministry of trade and industry and other agencies are going to set up a consortium of private firms with the participation of third countries, including Japan and the United States, to develop natural gas in Sakhalin, YONHAP News Agency reports.

The cabinet is also going to do everything possible to ensure that the Soviet Union participates in a new international economic forum—the Asia-Pacific Economic Council, a Foreign Ministry spokesman told YONHAP. The organisation, formed in 1989, includes Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United States, South Korea, Japan and six Asean countries. A discussion of the Soviet Union's possible membership in this regional association is expected to be put on the agenda of the Asia-Pacific Economic Council in Seoul in October.

#### **Prospects for Inter-Korean Relations Viewed**

*SK2304051891 Moscow International Service in Korean  
1100 GMT 22 Apr 91*

[Report by Kirin Mikhaylov on "Prospects of Development of Inter-Korean Relations" from "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] DPRK President Kim Il-song, in his recent interview with Japan's MAINICHI SHIMBUN, stated that he desires a peaceful Korean reunification.

The North Korean leader's answers to reporters clearly show that many obstacles still exist in the way of reunification. The North and South still disagree over reunification. They also sharply differ in their opinion on UN entry. There are other issues of dispute as well between the North and South. These issues should be settled by the nation divided at the 38th Parallel. It is natural, however, that the general situation in the region should influence the Korean Peninsula to a certain degree.

Today, this situation is seeking settlement of the confrontation. This is confirmed by President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan and the ROK. In the talks held in Tokyo and on Cheju Island, great attention was given to the Korean Peninsula. The Soviet president declared that he supports reunification of the Korean nation, giving considerable significance to the intergovernmental talks between the North and South.

China and some other countries in the region also desire the elimination of tension on the Korean Peninsula. From this viewpoint, the world takes as a positive development the Japan-North Korea dialogue toward normalization and the U.S.-North Korean meeting in Beijing. In a recent meeting, the U.S. side went so far as to state that it is considering enhancing the level of bilateral contact.

As for the North-South dialogue, the premier-level dialogue remains suspended because of the ROK-U.S. Team Spirit military exercise. Nevertheless, contacts in other areas continue. Even some briskness is felt there. There are reports that the indirect trade between the North and the South is increasing. Seoul and Pyongyang recently agreed to jointly form a junior soccer team. This will be the second formation of a joint sports team. The World Table Tennis Championships will begin in Japan on Wednesday, in which the joint North-South team will participate. They will participate in the championships under one flag with a green peninsula and with the "Arirang" [traditional Korean folk song] as national anthem. Who knows if this will become the symbol of Korea?

### East Europe

#### Honecker Transferred to Krasnogorsk Hospital

AU2304081091 Hamburg BILD in German  
23 Apr 91 pp 1, 5

[Karl-Ludwig Guensche report: "Unwelcome! Honecker Taken Away From Moscow"]

[Text] Erich Honecker is still on the run. Under cover of the night he and his wife Margot were taken away from Moscow in a limousine with curtained windows. The Moscow city administration had protested against his being accommodated in the airmen's hospital in Poporechin Prospekt 17. Yuriy Lushkov, chairman of the City Executive Committee: "Honecker's stay in Moscow is illegal." The former head of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and his wife were declared personae non gratae. In Moscow Honecker would have had no right to an apartment or to the allocation of food or cigarettes.

Honecker's new refuge: Krasnogorsk, 10 km south of Moscow. He has been taken to the Mandrika Hospital there. This is a military hospital, reserved for top people of the Defense Ministry and the Red Army. One wing of the hospital was cleared for Honecker. He is guarded by two bodyguards day and night. His condition has improved.

He has already taken a short walk in the strictly guarded park of the hospital. During the walk he had to be supported by his wife and one of the bodyguards.

#### Bessmertnykh-Honecker Meeting Alleged

LD2304163991 Berlin ADN in German 1611 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh has visited Erich Honecker, the former GDR head of state and Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] general secretary. ADN learned today from well-informed sources in the Soviet capital that the meeting took place in a military hospital in the Moscow suburb of Krasnogorsk, shortly before State President Gorbachev's visit to Japan.

Nothing is known about the contents of their discussion. However, observers assume that the question of political asylum in the Soviet Union for former SED functionaries was discussed. At the end of March the Soviet Foreign Ministry issued a statement saying that it is willing to examine applications for asylum from this group of persons. Moscow views the former high-ranking communist functionaries in the former GDR and the countries of eastern Europe as "victims of political persecution."

## Supreme Soviet

### Decision on Anti-Crisis Program Reported

*LD2304192791 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1812 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—The decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' action program for getting the economy out of crisis has been published here today. The document states:

Having examined the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' program of action for getting the country out of crisis, presented by the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To back the main provisions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' action program for getting the economy out of crisis, regarding it as the main substance of the USSR Government's work for the immediate future.

2. That the USSR Cabinet of Ministers should carry out the necessary finishing-off work on the program taking account of the remarks and suggestions of the republics, the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the standing commissions of its chambers and of USSR people's deputies. That the appropriate committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet should take part in the work to finish off the draft program.

The results of this work should be reported to the USSR Supreme Soviet before 20 May 1991.

3. That the USSR president and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers should, without delay, initiate the implementation of the action program to get the economy out of crisis, the consistent formation of market relations, and the setting in motion of a credit and finance system and the work of banks. Furthermore, special attention should be paid to stabilizing the sociopolitical situation, to maintaining a common economic area, and to ensuring the guaranteed formation of a pension fund, a social security fund, an employment fund, and an interrepublican public social protection fund.

Specific decisions on implementing the anticrisis program are to be developed and adopted in close cooperation with the republics.

4. That the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet should jointly with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers define more precisely the list of priority laws needed for the implementation of the program, which are liable to be examined at the fifth and sixth sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and bearing in mind that the other measures regarding the realization of the program will be settled by decrees of the USSR president, by decisions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the republics.

5. To acknowledge it is necessary to accelerate the setting up of an interrepublican state council for economic reform, having charged it with the implementation of the

methodical leadership and coordination of the actions of the republics in implementing the anticrisis program and shaping market relations.

6. To recommend to the Supreme Soviets of the republics, the bodies of state power, and administration of all levels that active work be organized regarding the extensive clarification and implementation of the anticrisis program, applying both economic as well as, where necessary, administrative measures, to implement the program directives, taking into account the development conditions of the relevant republics and regions.

7. To hear the information of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on the progress in implementing the action program to get the country's economy out of crisis at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in October 1991.

The decision was signed by A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

### Supreme Soviet Proceedings 23 Apr Detailed

*LD2304211691*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1850 GMT on 23 April broadcasts a 50-minute "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program of recorded excerpts of proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 23 April.

The announcer says that the discussion of the government program to extricate the country from the crisis ended and that most deputies backed it. He then introduces some excerpts of speeches from the debate.

Deputy Pecherov from the Ukraine calls for the creation of conditions to implement the government anti-crisis program successfully because it is the last chance to stabilize society. He is followed by Deputy Samarin who urges measures to counter monopolies and calls for a political consultative council under the president. He criticizes Soyuz members for trying to return the country to an obsolete system of government. Support for Gorbachev is a precondition for solving their problems, he believes.

Deputy Kurtashin then criticizes the notion of combining political and economic changes, for the loss of power has caused the country's problems, he believes. He says that some people are exploiting freedom of expression and that the market economy is an idea dreamed up by economists in ivory towers.

Deputy Tsyplyeyev calls for clear criteria for implementing a policy of privatization; the individual must not be excluded from the process, he says. He criticizes the view that large scientific-technical enterprises should not be privatized. He cites General Dynamics in the United States as an example. He calls for an independent employer between the government and workers to avert strikes.

An unidentified deputy says that a market economy cannot work without a stable ruble and calls for measures to enable soviet enterprises to enter the foreign market as equal partners. Deputy Komarov then comments on the country's housing problems and criticizes the lack of a comprehensive program to tackle them. He suggests that privatization alone is not the answer.

Soyuz Deputy Yuriy Blokhin then speaks:

"The discussion of the government program to extricate the economy from the crisis is proceeding in the usual fashion in a businesslike manner. There is both criticism and a constructive approach, and the majority, as Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov] has already noted, are coming around to the idea of the program, and, as usual, the Supreme Soviet will adopt the program. Indeed, why should it not? It contains a great deal of good sense and it has inherited 80 percent of the main guidelines for stabilizing the national economy and switching to a market economy. However, there is a very great doubt, which was expressed at the Soyuz congress of deputies from all levels [held on 20-21 April]. It has also been voiced here. It is that this program will also fall into oblivion, since in the present sociopolitical and social and economic situation, however good the program may be, it cannot be fulfilled.

"The country is in a deep crisis and facing an impending catastrophe, the slump in production is increasing, the decline in living standards is galloping, strikes and interethnic confrontation are spreading, anarchy is intensifying and lawlessness is on the increase. All this, taken together, explains the present acute situation and the need to adopt the most resolute measures, by introducing a state of emergency through the whole territory of our country for a minimum period of six months, from April to October. The [Soyuz] people's deputies from all levels were unanimous on this. Here too, those who are a little less optimistic are talking about the same thing.

"A state of emergency is the necessary, decisive condition without which all other anti-crisis measures will remain a pious hope. A catastrophe in the country will be simply unavoidable. USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev must accept this. It is his moral duty. The USSR Supreme Soviet also has a legal basis for introducing a state of emergency: Article 113, Paragraph 13 of the USSR Constitution and the law on the legal regime for a state of emergency. You should not be afraid of the words state of emergency and refer to hotheads. You need only look at our press and listen to our radio and television. Everywhere people are writing and saying the same thing: an emergency situation, an emergency budget, emergency measures and the like.

"Indeed, we are in a general crisis, and we need shock actions, if I may use that expression here, for everybody's sake; procrastination is akin to death. A state of emergency will ensure the conditions for implementing urgent measures to enable the state to survive and to

stabilize the social and political situation. Here, we feel, and this was discussed at the Soyuz congress of deputies from all levels, that emergency measures should be implemented immediately: Today, measures connected first with carrying out the spring sowing and providing the country's population with food; Second, with lifting the sociopsychological tension in society, and third, with strengthening and in a number of cases restoring the vertical structures of authority.

"In the period of the state of emergency, and subsequently, in the period of stabilization and growth, it will also be necessary to guarantee the unity of the economic and legal framework throughout the country; to effect the removal of state property from state control in an organized fashion and not to allow unrestrained privatization—meaning the kind which leads, uncontrolled, not to the contemporary stage of capitalism, but to its savage stage, with its degradation of man; to step up the activity of light industry; to intensify the reorientation of the military industrial complex toward satisfying the population's demand for consumer goods; and to stop the destruction of scientific-technical potential, which is in full swing, especially in the case of fundamental science. Children, women and families must receive the utmost support. The system of health care and culture must develop. The potential of the Army and the clergy must be involved widely in ensuring survival and growth, as the task of saving the people and the fatherland.

"These, in our opinion, are probably not all, but the main emergency measures which cannot be delayed and need to be implemented to stop the negative processes and to create the groundwork and the conditions for moving forward, for extricating ourselves from a total crisis, and for subsequent development," Blokhin concludes.

Blokhin is followed by two deputies who make short comments on the five percent sales tax and the problem of industrial ownership.

Deputy Minayev speaks of the problem of introducing price reform in the heavily monopolistic Soviet economy and backs Samarin's call for antimonopoly legislation. Deputy Ryabchenko sets out recommendations of the Inter-Regional Group which include calls for antimonopoly legislation and tax reform. Deputy Pupkevich stresses the importance of popular support and reward for work done.

The announcer summarizes contributions by several other deputies which supported the government program on the whole. The announcer continues:

"At the end of the debate [USSR Prime Minister] Valentin Pavlov made a concluding speech. He dwelled on just a few of the most controversial points in the anticrisis program. For example, asked whether the government has a realistic blueprint for emerging from the spate of miners' strikes, he said that the solution lies through the mining associations and mines becoming

independent. The most dangerous thing, the prime minister stressed, would be if the matter were confined to replacing signboards; in other words, if the enterprises were just transferred from a department of the USSR Ministry of Coal Industry to the Ministry of Coal Industry of Russia or the Ukraine.

"On the whole, the prime minister acknowledged, it is quite hard to make a sound concluding speech on an issue that has not been left alone for several weeks, either by the Cabinet of Ministers or by the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. He confined himself to an appeal to everyone involved in implementing the program for emerging from the crisis to regard as of paramount importance the idea of the unity of our goals and the salvation of our country and our peoples.

"The deputies adopted a decision in which the Supreme Soviet supports the main provisions of the Cabinet of Ministers action program for extricating the economy from crisis. The Cabinet of Ministers is instructed, following final agreement with the republics and after taking into account the proposals arising from the discussion, to submit to the country's Supreme Soviet not later than 20 May the definitive version of the program. The country's legislature deemed it necessary to speed up the creation of an interrepublican state council on economic reform, entrusting it with exercising methodical leadership and coordinating the republics' actions in implementing the anticrisis program and the formation of market relations.

"Tomorrow the Supreme Soviet is working in committees and permanent commissions of the chambers. The next plenary session will take place on 26 April," the announcer concludes.

Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 1400 GMT on 23 April carries a report on the session which adds the following voting figures: "Voting has just taken place on the draft decision on adopting this program as a whole: 323 deputies voted in favor, 13 voted against, and 29 people's deputies, members of the Supreme Soviet, abstained."

#### **Pavlov Answers Questions**

*LD2304162691 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov has called on the national parliament to approve the governmental anti-crisis programme and purposefully implement it "in the name of saving the country and our peoples".

Pavlov addressed the Soviet parliament today to answer questions on the governmental anti-crisis programme announced on Monday.

He said its authors did not aim to make it comprehensive and detailed. "It is impossible, for public life is so

complex and concrete that neither the government nor a whole data-processing centre can tackle all issues in one programme," Pavlov stressed.

"We think the programme should aim to bring our society and republics together. Otherwise, any programme, no matter how good it looks, is doomed to failure," Pavlov said.

He agreed that the programme is "tough", but said it was necessary to avoid "shock therapy", which "could lead to people's passivity or destructive actions by authorities at all levels".

He said the government drew upon the experience of previous programmes.

Commenting on the appeal by the parliamentary faction Soyuz to impose a state of emergency in the country to carry out the programme, Pavlov said "I would not impose a nation-wide state of emergency".

He, however, would immediately impose it in power engineering, banks and tax agencies, on transport and in certain regions.

Pavlov said that in connection with the price reform on April 2 and the overall decline in living standards, the government has prepared a presidential decree on the enactment of an income indexation system.

He said the indexation of price rises and the consumer's basket will be determined by republics. "I hope that soon the president will sign the decree," Pavlov said.

#### **Pavlov Concluding Remarks**

*LD2304193391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1707 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[From the "Legislative Diary" program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 23 April]

[Text] At the evening session Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, the country's prime minister, first answered deputies' questions and then made a brief concluding speech:

[Begin recording] We are not seeking to give you a comprehensive and detailed program. That is impossible, because public life is so complex and concrete that not even a single comprehensive computing center, let alone the cabinet, can give that whole question in any single program. We considered, therefore, that it was necessary to give the main thing, that would make it possible to unite our society, our republics, around that program, because without that any program, however ideal it might be in words, is doomed to failure.

So we should like to appeal today to all who in one way or another are involved in accomplishing the tasks of extricating the economy from crisis to agree on a single approach toward more work on the program and its intended implementation, having it in mind to regard of

paramount importance unity of action on behalf of our common goals—the salvation of the country and of our peoples. [end recording]

Yes, it is necessary to live. It is necessary to work. Enough of this squabbling, the premier also said from the rostrum today, seeming to meditate [as heard]. The country, after all, is behind us.

Following a vote, the draft "Program of Action To Extricate the Economy From Crisis" proposed by the Cabinet of Ministers was adopted by a majority.

Tomorrow the deputies will be working in committees and commissions.

### **Pavlov Presents 'Anti-Crisis' Action Program**

CM2404081991 Moscow PRATDA in Russian  
23 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 2,3

[Report by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 22 April: "Labor: Responsibility: Consolidation: USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov's Report at the USSR Supreme Soviet Session 22 April"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies!

An action program for extricating the economy from the crisis has been presented for your examination. It embraces measures which have a single aim—the urgent normalization of production processes, improvement of finances and money circulation, and the creation of a system of social guarantees in the interests of safeguarding the population's livelihood. The development and support of enterprise, reduction of state control of the economy, its demonopolization, and intensified foreign economic activity are seen as the basis for resolving these tasks, taking the road of forging ahead toward the market.

The program also contains broad strategic guidelines for the government's activity in structural perestroika of the economy and accelerating scientific and technical progress.

In the organizational sphere and matters of state construction the key role is given to cooperation between the center and the republics in a new environment. This is one of the most important conditions for implementing the anticrisis program.

The program has been thoroughly examined and discussed at committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers, at meetings with representatives of public organizations, unions and associations, and scientific institutions, in the republics, and in organs of state government. Therefore, permit me in my report to touch only on the most fundamental issues.

What do I consider that I must dwell on first of all, what is virtually everyone asking about—what on earth has happened in the country?

There is just one answer—the situation can be described only as a general crisis. What are the main manifestations of this, and what is its scale?

First. The decline in production is increasing and is becoming universal. Whereas in 1990 the national income fell by four percent and production of industrial output by 1.2 percent, in the first quarter of this year they fell by 10 percent and five percent respectively. The crisis has already spread from heavy industry to consumer goods production. In the January-March period the latter fell by three percent, including a two percent decline in food production. There was an eight percent decline in production of light industry goods.

As you know, there is chronic stagnation in agricultural production. For decades the country has been unable to feed the population on its own. Even with last year's record grain harvest in the granaries we were compelled to procure grain abroad. For several years now we have been importing one in seven kg of butter, one in three kg of vegetable oil, and between one in two and one in three kg of sugar.

This inferno is now threatening to spread further. In the first quarter gross agricultural output fell by 13 percent. Output of the basic types of livestock produce was down by 8-12 percent, in other words to the 1987 level. If this process is not halted it may slip to the 1983 level. However, since that time the population has grown by approximately 20 million.

Second. The extremely deformed structure of the national economy has made it impossible to reorient it quickly to meet the consumer's needs.

Despite the measures adopted over the last few years, the proportion of consumer items within the overall volume of industrial production still has not reached even one third. And the services sphere within the overall volume of gross national product accounts for only 20 percent.

Third. The crisis of production is accompanied and aggravated by a crisis in the financial and credit system. The aggregate budget deficit, in the USSR Ministry of Finances' estimation, could amount to 200 billion rubles [R] this year, and this with an existing internal state debt that has exceeded R540 billion. This is extremely dangerous in conditions of a decline in production.

The catastrophic situation in the financial sphere is today linked also with lack of unity in the financial policy of the center and republics and the de facto elimination, without preliminary arrangements, of a united financial and credit system, in the name of combatting the imperial diktat. Contrary to the economic agreement that has been concluded, a number of republics are refusing to pay toward Union needs. They take care primarily of their own needs while nationwide ones are left without means. As a result, in the first quarter the Union budget received less than 40 percent of the planned income while its deficit, according to the

results of the quarter, exceeded the top value set for the year. Similar processes are developing within the republics, too.

If this situation persists, the financing of most important social, ecological and production programs of nationwide and republican importance will be frustrated.

The financial crisis is the main cause of the continuing collapse of monetary circulation, the depreciation of the ruble, and the decline in confidence in it among both the population and enterprises.

Fourth. The currency crisis. The volume of oil extraction and of other energy sources as well as their prices on world markets have dropped, and accordingly so have receipts from exports. But the country's dependency on imports has been preserved, in particular, in foodstuffs, light industry, supplies for the automobile and tractor manufacturing industries. The country proved to be depending on foreign creditors.

According to last year's trade results we are in debt to almost all countries, even in Eastern Europe—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Today they are also to be paid in freely convertible currency.

But there is an end to borrowing. The time has come to pay off debts. While in 1981 we allocated R3.8 billion in freely convertible currency to pay off external debt and the interest on it, this year it is necessary to pay off 12 billion. This is equivalent to losses of almost R60 billion if the level of domestic prices is taken into account.

These are all manifestations of the economic crisis. But one must not keep quiet also about an unprecedented exacerbation of interethnic relations, a wave of crime, and a crisis of spirituality and culture.

So what are the reasons for this disease which has affected all spheres of our country's life?

The main and deep-rooted reason is that we failed to recognize and understand in time that old and traditional sources of the country's development and prosperity are close to exhaustion, and that the proportion of these which is used for confronting the entire West in the military sphere is becoming increasingly back-breaking....

At a time when all leading countries as early as the mid-Sixties turned to the active saving of resources and placed their reliance on scientific and technical progress and information technology, we continued our extensive development.

We built up the volume of production by drawing in more and more new resources. We consumed what nature gave us, what our grandfathers and fathers had stored up, pretending that "everything was all right."

The results of such a rapacious attitude to national resources began to tell. At first slowly, and now, one can say, like an avalanche. In the last two years alone the

volume of coal extraction, without strikes, has fallen by 69 million tonnes, of oil by 53 million tonnes, procurements of timber by 50 million cubic meters. What economy can support such blows?

Even an average, by world standards, level of utilizing raw resources will allow the basic problems to be eliminated. But the extreme backwardness of technology and the worn-out state of production equipment do not allow this. The erosion of the fixed productive capital during the last five-year period rose from 38 to 41 percent. The actual service life of industrial equipment is twice the normative figure.

It is precisely here that the reasons for the extremely unsatisfactory conditions of work in many enterprises, for the low quality, and for the growing ecological crisis are hidden. Their removal demands ever greater means and it is exactly these that are insufficient even to support production itself.

Technological backwardness in the end is the main reason for the hard currency crisis as well. It does not allow the structure of exports and imports to be reconstructed or the trends and developing situations on the world market to be utilized effectively.

Many mistakes have been made in economic policy during perestroika as well. Most important is the delay in practical, cardinal actions, the calculation that everything can be done voluntarily, and hence the violation of the necessary sequence of actions. All the so-called unpopular measures were at best mooted, then always postponed. But one cannot first sow, then plow. Let us take price reform as an example. It was under discussion for more than 10 years. In 1982 and 1987 decisions were made and practical preparations were made. But you will all remember how and why it was yet again postponed.

To drag out reform benefits the people only at first glance. In actual fact this amounts to retaining pay-leveling. The fact is that to pay subsidies to some people, however noble the end, other people have to be underpaid for their work. Production quotas have to be squeezed and pay levels lowered. There is no other way. If subsidies become several times greater than the price itself one cannot hope for even a minimal level of commitment on the part of the producer to increasing output or for him to have an attitude of respect for what he is producing. And once extra-economic coercion—or to put it bluntly, fear—recedes, then the only result can be a reduction in work and output, which is what we have.

The deferring of reform increased the disproportion in price levels further and further and drove the sickness in more deeply. As a result, the price that had to be paid for the price reform of this April proved to be considerably higher than it would have been if that reform had been carried out at the proper time. The fact is that in 1987, for instance, beef was priced at R4.50 while today it is R7. That is still quite low. In the Baltic republics,

Georgia, and other republics, where they are wholly covering their outlay, prices have gone as high as R11 or R12.

Society's reaction to the reform of price-setting which has been carried out is negative. But, to be honest, who expected anything else? A problem that affects the material interests of every person, every labor collective, and every region cannot be resolved painlessly. Even more so in our conditions which are characterized by the huge disproportion between price levels and almost universal shortage. Only the firm conviction that there is no other way has given us the decisiveness to assume this responsibility for ourselves.

Today, attempts are being made from all sides to prove that the government has dipped into the population's pockets and has shifted the full burden of the price reform to them. These assertions by no means correspond to reality.

In the first place, as I have already stated repeatedly, 85 percent of the additional revenue from the rise in prices, calculated from the volume of production and the sale of goods in 1990, is to go toward compensation and toward raising wages in nonproduction sectors. I have already told you where we stand, effectively, in terms of production. And payments are made per capita. So this is what the point is. It is not by chance that everyone, down to the last republic, confirms that their outlay for compensation is greater than their income from the difference in prices.

In the second place, virtually all of the republics that are receiving the difference in prices in full can increase compensation as compared to the level which the Union guarantees. All enterprises have also been given such a right. This means that it is necessary to work and earn. It is our habit, however, to request and demand. If someone gives—fine, if he doesn't—away with him. But there is nothing to give. This is the illusion.

Of course, we know, and we have discussed this openly in this hall and elsewhere, that for different sections of the population, additional expenditure caused by the rise in prices is not equally covered by compensation.

The last study showed that in families with an average per capita income of up to R75 per month, 118 percent of losses have been compensated, while in families with an income of more than R200—only 40 percent. In preparing the price reform the government never concealed the fact that it sees its main task in maintaining the living standard of precisely the most vulnerable sections of the population. For others the main path, as for the country as a whole, is to increase production and, on this basis, incomes. Otherwise, about which market are we debating from the rostrums, making profound conclusions at symposiums and in our own and the foreign press? Is it really about one in which the prime minister has to issue instructions to set the price for clothes pegs? Although we are being strongly urged toward this. Thus, a few days ago, on the Moscow

television program they showed a workshop for the production of cakes. The girl bakers said with indignation that they have overstocked and that there is no demand for their cakes at R11 each. As a result, the workshop stands idle for half the day, earnings have dropped from R240 to R100. The result? Pavlov is to blame! Why did the TV reporter, evidently a master of his trade, not ask a simple little question: Who set the price for you, and who is preventing you from lowering it? Is it not yourselves? Under the conditions of a real market, such an enterprise will inevitably go bankrupt.

I particularly draw your attention to this, because presently unprecedented pressure is being exerted on the USSR Government, which is opting for compromises. On one hand, there is a general understanding, on the other, a whipping up of tension, with demands to lower, and even to return all the old wholesale, purchase and retail prices. There is even deliberate distortion of the price formation policy with a clearly expressed wish to heap all the blame on the center.

When we were preparing the price reform and were agreeing it with the republics, we considered that apartment rents, the prices for municipal services, and prices for urban transportation should not be increased today. Some regions did not agree with this position and raised these prices and tariffs. Why they timed, let's say, the increase in payments for bath houses, hairdressers, and for travel on the Moscow metro for 2 April is an interesting question, but not the main one.

The main thing is that it was not, and could not have been, allowed for in the compensation and it aroused additional discontent. And yet here a clear principle should be in operation: whoever raises prices is obliged to ensure also the social protection of the population or individual parts of it. The situation with factory and student canteens was provoked by whom and how? It was discussed, foreseen, and decided beforehand. It is clear to everyone that there is no need to issue instruction from the Kremlin on how to compensate the price of Borsch. Why did ZIL [Moscow automobile factory] and other factories do this beforehand, while in Minsk this was let slip? In some places people are being consciously deluded, I believe, by those who try by all means to form a negative attitude toward the Union Government which is evidently preventing the achievement of some kind of other goals.

The government is presently receiving many businesslike approaches and proposals from labor collectives and public organizations on making more precise individual points of the prices reform and the system for the social protection of the population. A special group of responsible workers from the central economic bodies under the leadership of Deputy Prime Minister Comrade Shcherbakov has been created to resolve these issues urgently.

But nevertheless we have passed the first and, in my opinion, most complicated stage of the price formation reform.

The main thing here today is, in accordance with the doctors' maximums—not to cause harm, and I will say, to avoid returning to the issue of prices, that the government's stance is expressed with the utmost openness in the program—we are proposing to move toward their consistent liberalization in all areas of the economy, together with an indexation of the population's wages. It will be difficult. Not all sections of the population will automatically receive an addition to their incomes. We speak frankly of this.

There is a large part in our program on the system of social guarantees. We consider it of the utmost importance to minimize society's social costs during the transitional period and to facilitate the processes of adaptation to market conditions. But our every decision demands resources, not only ruble resources, but most important—goods to cover them. What sense is there in pensions and grants increasing if there will be nothing to buy with them?

This is why we have weighed up all our possibilities and taken as our point of departure an evaluation of the real state of affairs. Only on this basis can we set the minimum level for state guarantees. Guarantees, not promises.

The theme of how one must live within one's means is as old as the world. But to date, we have not mastered this law. Over and over again populist demands to raise wages, increase pensions and benefits and urgently introduce new lengths of time for leave can be heard. How much this would cost and where the funds are to be found, no one says. It is done only for the sake of shouting ever more loudly: "I am with you, I am for the people." And what does a shortening of the working day and a lowering of the retirement age lead to when the shelves are empty and when there is a shortage of milkmaids, machine operators, and workers in other decisive professions? If previously there were "drifters"—workers after the easy life, then now, whole factories have started to search for "the Promised Land."

Inconsistency in carrying out economic transformations has resulted in a loss of the ability to control the national economy.

A disruption of economic ties has started, a striving toward autarky and attempts at overcoming the crisis on one's own have become stronger. There has been colorful proliferation of barter, and restrictions on the movement of goods between regions are being set up. In the end all this has resulted in even greater losses. We have lost the advantages of concentration, specialization and cooperation, territorial division of labor, and a single market space.

The country is shaken by interethnic conflicts and economic and political strikes. This is taking place in

conditions when any additional malfunction within the life-support system leads to a domino effect and inflicts irreparable damage on the national economy.

Permit me to offer a brief calculation: in March coal extraction fell by 13 percent and that of coking coals by one third. In connection with this, the direct decrease of production output in the national economy over a month amounts to R1.4 billion and, taking into account related industries, to more than R4 billion. If the wave of strikes is not stopped, then according to the most modest estimations, losses will amount to approximately R50 billion if calculated out over a year. Taking the whole of April into account, there are even more pessimistic estimates—R100 billion. But there are, indeed, such people who believe that the worse things become, the better. For whom? There are already no secrets. Read at least KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, which lost its Komsomol character long ago. The miners' strikes have outgrown the industry and regional frameworks. Today they have an extremely negative influence on the whole country. Moreover, the world community is watching them with alarm.

The French paper, TRIBUNE DE L'EXPANSION, considers, and I quote: "Uncertainty over the future of the Soviet Union places in doubt the whole strategy for the development of the mining industry in the rest of the world." We have defined ways of dealing with the economic demands. We have signed an agreement with the miners, with the general confederation of trade unions. Beyond that, order is needed. The law must operate.

So what needs to be done to correct the situation in which the economy now is?

There are many judgments on this, but in effect they all amount to two.

The first is an immediate return to the old administrative command system, best of all in a full-blown way.

The futility of such proposals requires no proof, if only because it was precisely that system which caused the crisis now afflicting our country.

The second—and really the only one—is the creation of a fundamentally new system of production relations, a socially oriented market economy. The path of building a law-based democratic state, a renewed federation of sovereign republics. This is the path which our country must follow, having embarked on the road to radical economic reform and thorough-going transformations in the state and political mechanism of our society.

Yet even along this solely true direction there may be a large number of different ways in which events may develop. Of that plethora of options there are three that are most likely.

The first is founded on the assumption that no special anticrisis measures are taken. Economic processes in the country are regulated by the current methods, and the

sociopolitical situation develops in accordance with the current trend based on the present-day balance and distribution of forces and interests and their practical actions.

We considered that with this option national income will fall by approximately 20 percent annually. This means that in the remaining nine months until the end of the year the losses of national income will reach 23-25 percent. Stoppages and disruptions in a number of industries and mainly in processing industries are inevitable. It is entirely obvious that we will not be able to stabilize the situation, with such a great fall, even by the end of 1992.

The disruption of economic ties and labor discipline and increased strike movement are seen as responsible for losses in volume of industrial production of at least 20 percent.

The accumulated assets and fund for capital investment in the national economy will be reduced extremely tangibly. Moreover, the reduction will seriously affect the rural areas and social sector. We will not build residential houses, hospitals, schools, and roads.

The level of consumption of material wealth per capita of the country's population is to fall by at least 15-20 percent. It seems there is no need to explain that the main blow will fall on those who are employed by state enterprises and institutions, and on poorly protected sections of the population: pensioners, invalids, and families with many children. Calculations show that here the living standard may have fallen by almost one-fourth already by the end of the year. Any attempts to ensure social protection of these sections of society in these conditions are virtually impossible. There are neither financial nor material resources available for this purpose.

Most grave consequences will arise from a mass stoppage of production which will entail a sharp rise in unemployment. Up to 18 million people may be left without means of subsistence.

I think I will not be mistaken if I say that in this case a social explosion will take place long before the calendar year expires.

The second variant takes as its point of departure the complete renunciation of state interference in the economy and is based on an accelerated transfer exclusively to market relations. Its advocates believe that the harsh laws of the market will themselves correct the situation, normalize economic relations and lead to an upturn in the economy.

Such a path is possible, but at the first stage it will provoke an even greater decline in production and will lead to mass closure of enterprises and to unemployment, exorbitant price rises, and impoverishment of the

majority of the population. The conditions of an uncontrolled, unprepared market will cost society very dearly. Mass disturbances, strikes, pogroms, and civil disobedience are inevitable.

Expert assessments and the calculations produced show that under this variant the volume of national income and industrial output in the current year will fall by no less than 30 percent and the total number of unemployed will amount to about 30 million. The scale of such losses is unimaginable and the negative reaction of the population cannot be assessed.

Finally, there is the third variant of the solution, the one we have chosen. This is the one submitted for your examination in the form of an action program. It is the path of decisive, I would say harsh, but consistent measures for whose implementation the main social forces, all republics and regions, enterprises and their labor collectives must be engaged, in complete understanding and responsibility.

The variant entails the fewest losses and social costs and gives people the chance of adapting to the changing conditions.

If the program receives public support, if efforts can be consolidated toward implementing it fully, then one can say with confidence that we will be able to avert irreversible changes in society.

On this basis a real possibility to stop the process of sliding toward an economic collapse and to stabilize the economy before this year ends will be created.

The main thing is that a comprehensive and consistent implementation of the measures that have been mapped out will make it possible to break the course of events, and the population will be able to expect that as soon as this October, recovery of the level of production and consumption of some very important kinds of output and goods will begin, albeit slowly. I must admit frankly though that it will be impossible to recover in full the losses of the first quarter. We would manage to restrain the falling consumption fund which determines the population's living standards. The scale of possible unemployment can be brought down to a manageable size if the measures that have been mapped out are implemented in full. We count on the fact that by creating a network of small enterprises and farms, regrouping the work force into the sphere of domestic services, public amenities, and road construction, the majority of people will find a sphere of application for their skills, and hence will receive the necessary means of subsistence. The payment of direct unemployment benefits can be regarded as an extreme measure and everything possible should be done in order to keep the number of unemployed at a minimum. The program has been designed precisely for this.

On what principles and in what conditions can this version be implemented? The program combines economic and market instruments with administrative

methods. In this we proceed from the fact that the nature of the measures that are being adopted must correspond to the crisis situation.

In the program that has been presented you will find a number of specific instances, although only a few of them, in which the government intends to employ methods of state coercion. On the basis of this, there are those who are stating today that the program is virtually counting on the methods of war communism.

I must state in connection with this that radical economic reform cannot progress without strong state power. But it is not a matter of arbitrariness but rather of the law and of the legal methods to implement it. In this sense, order and discipline really are as necessary to us as the air. The government is to strive for these to be restored based on accord among all democratic forces. The price of lack of discipline and spinelessness on our part could prove to be too great.

If one approaches without prejudice the program that is being proposed, then it is easy to be convinced of the fact that the administrative solutions are for the most part organizational in character. They are only necessary to stabilize the situation.

Yes, we are openly calling for a moratorium on political strikes to be declared. And yes, we are resolutely against meetings during working hours.

We do not have the means to satisfy at a stroke all the demands of the strike committees, including the one that they be maintained at state expense. They would not appear immediately for any new government. The more valuable working time that is lost today, the more quickly we sink into the mire of debt. It is necessary to look at our proposals from this standpoint. Those who do not allow people to work, who disrupt production by means of bribes and threats, deception, or direct force, and who supposedly fight for the interests of the people while leaving them without the means of subsistence should answer to the law and to their consciences, regardless of what positions they occupy.

Not everyone by any means will back this, of course. There will certainly be people who will start accusing the government of attacking the rights of the working people and of having dictatorial ambitions. I categorically disagree with those who view them as an attempt to stifle democracy. We have no such goals!

There is no democracy without discipline in the natural world. Where there is no discipline and order, nothing but chaos reigns. We do not intend to be led along by those who allegedly do not understand this and who are intentionally striving to inflame passions and sow discord. If we have to use administrative methods to fight against them then we will have to do so. If people must be dismissed from their posts and brought to trial—then that must be done, too. Decisively, what is more.

One of the most important directions in the government's activity will be implementation of measures to achieve a radical change in the position of the individual in the economy, to create conditions for him to have an interest in working efficiently, in rational economic management and in displaying initiative and resourcefulness. Here lies the most important reserve, one we can and must bring into play. How can this be done? Above all, by unfettering producers and introducing competition between them, by developing entrepreneurship and engaging effective market mechanisms.

This, in its turn, assumes radical changes in ownership. The means of production must, finally, have a real master. We have talked long and hard about the need to inculcate in people the feelings of being the master. It is my conviction that there is no need to inculcate this, rather what we need to do is make the individual a real master, and on this basis radically enhance the efficiency of our economy.

In accordance with such an understanding of the problem, the program provides for a package of measures on privatization and taking property out of state hands. The government's position on this issue is well known.

It is reflected in the draft of the corresponding law you supported at the first reading. Therefore, I will dwell only on the more acute questions asked during the discussion of the Cabinet's action program in the commissions and committees, and at the meetings with scientists, public unions, and specialists.

First of all I would like to point out that we are not setting the task of the complete liquidation of state ownership of production means, as some people are saying. Such a thing does not happen even in Western countries. Especially when you take into account the size of our country and its traditions of collectivism and statehood, such an approach is quite unacceptable. At the same time we are proceeding from the fact that to achieve a transition to a market economy it is necessary to create a definite critical mass of independent nonstate enterprises that would ensure the operation of the market mechanisms of self-development and regulation.

At first it is envisaged to place particular emphasis on so-called small-scale privatization, embracing a considerable number of trade, public catering and consumer-service enterprises, small industrial enterprises, and enterprises in other spheres. We proceed from the fact that even before the end of this year, approximately one third, and in 1992 no less than two-thirds of small enterprises in these spheres should be withdrawn from state ownership. The main burden in this work will fall, of course, on the local bodies, and the center and the republics must render them organizational and methodical assistance and coordinate activities.

As far as medium and large enterprises are concerned, here the need to create real bosses who are interested in

and responsible for not only current income but also the development of production also compels us to act more vigorously.

A transformation of state enterprises into shareholding societies and companies, and the formation of collective (people's) enterprises should be effected.

Maybe this is not fashionable, but I would say that it is necessary to wage a campaign to float state enterprises. At the same time it is necessary to ensure a fast, 18-month transfer of a minimum of 10 percent of the shares or value of the property of all state enterprises into the ownership of members of the labor collective and other citizens. Of course, a significant portion of shares in the first stage will remain the property of the state. As regards the sale of this portion, it will then of course require more than one year.

In this respect we consider it necessary to resolve two tasks. First, not to permit the utilization of "dirty," unjustly earned money for the buying up of state property. An appropriate mechanism will be devised. Second, to create the conditions for the majority of workers to invest part of their earnings in shares, ensuring by so doing the opportunity to acquire ownership and receive additional income. To this end, it is proposed to free from income tax the wages and other money income of the population directed toward the acquisition of shares, or the clearing of credits which will be issued for this purpose. The same benefits must also be made available to enterprises that use their profit to buy out state property and for investments.

Taking into account the fact that we regard our main task as the removal from state control and the privatization of enterprises, and not by exchanging Union diktat for the diktat of the republic or the region, we are proposing to delimit in the near future the functions for carrying this work through, charging the Union with removing from state control only very major enterprises which have special significance for the country as a whole.

As for the delimitation of ownership, it is more rational to tackle this task as a part of the process for removing things from state control by means of distributing stocks and shares according to the importance of the enterprises to the national economy and the distribution of functions between the Union and republics. Besides, we support the proposal that local bodies must also be holders of a portion of state shares. This will make it possible for unity of interests on an economic basis to be guaranteed at all levels of administration.

The government proceeds from the fact that the issue of the delimitation of ownership should be resolved completely by 1 July—as has been agreed upon earlier. In the near future it is necessary to formulate general principles of administration and interaction for the future, to consolidate them in a special agreement and to use them as guidelines in practical work. At the same time the

USSR Cabinet of Ministers certainly does not intend to display usurping aspirations of any kind, as some people say.

While attaching great importance to the removal from state control and privatization, at the same time we believe that it is necessary to improve drastically the work of state enterprises, and here wide development of contract-based entrepreneurial activity may become an important direction. Indeed, why can a leader of a state enterprise or an administration as a whole not act as a true entrepreneur in accordance with a contract, undertaking of course obligations before the state as a whole for developing production and improving the material and social situation of workers?

Legal conditions for this have already been created. We intend to launch specific practical work.

An important direction in the work for stepping up people's labor activity and improving their lives is wages reform. The start has already been made here. State guarantees of the minimum wage for various professionally qualified groups of working people have been established. Size restrictions on individual earnings have been lifted. Enterprises have been granted the right to independently determine the forms and systems of pay.

Next is the formation of a fundamentally new mechanism of attaining public accord on issues of formation of wage rates and salaries, and social guarantees for workers in specific branches of the national economy. This will be the mechanism of a trilateral social partnership between leaders of unions, concerns, joint-stock companies, enterprises, who express the interests of the owner of means of production, trade unions, which are representatives of working people, and also the government. Moreover, negotiations should be based on the following principle: The wage and the consumption fund should, on the whole, be linked to the growth of the final results of production.

Finally, we must realize that if such a link is absent, if the demands to increase pay two-fold are being put forward at the time of a fall in production, then this can only result in a new price spiral. Nothing happens by magic. If wages are increased without an increase in goods, then there will be empty shelves in the shops, with administrative restriction of prices, and a new spiral of inflation will all the same still be inevitable in the next stage.

And first and foremost, the elderly, families with many children and students, that is to say, those people on fixed incomes or those who cannot attain an increase in wages by means of ultimatums, are the ones who suffer from such games, which can only be described as self-delusion.

I think that the people will understand that those who, in the name of personal popularity or other egotistical goals, are today urging people to strike and to demand an increase in wages without a corresponding improvement

in their work, are carrying out an immoral policy contrary to the public interest, aimed at the collapse of the country and of its production potential, which will ultimately bring about a further worsening of living conditions.

The government's task is to realistically evaluate our possibilities today and to focus attention on key problems and issues on which the fate of the national economy and the living conditions of every Soviet person depend.

The main difficulty lies in the fact that it is necessary to implement the planned measures amid conditions of a significant fall in production and a reduction of all types of resources. There is no surplus of anything in the country today: resources, money, or labor. There is nothing further for us to share out. We need to jointly determine things: This is the main thing, without which we simply cannot survive, and we will direct all our strength and means towards this.

The urgent primary tasks in our program include the problems of foodstuffs and medicines, transport, and power engineering. Any attempts to broaden this circle, even with a plausible motive, will inevitably lead to a dissipation of resources; it will excessively prolong the stabilization period and will not yield the desired result. We are heavily relying on an understanding of this aspect.

The Cabinet of Ministers is of course obliged to devote its attention to all areas of the country's economic life and will tackle the tasks facing it in the course of its daily activities.

But the circumstances force one to shift sharply the emphasis, to choose the highest priorities and to regard the individual's vital needs as of paramount importance. This is the main thing in the program's concept.

Proceeding from these positions we tried to create the most favorable and preferential terms for the branches which work to satisfy the needs of agriculture, food, and meat and dairy industries. In order to resolve the problems of foodstuffs we must opt for the most resolute and extreme measures.

But one has to be aware of the fact that the main burden of resolving this task of the utmost importance falls on the backs of republics, local soviets, and mainly of the immediate producers of food products and agricultural raw materials for their production.

You will also find in the program measures aimed at ensuring the continuous operation of transportation and the power network. We have arrived at the profound conviction that here one should opt for the toughest decisions. The situation forces us to do so.

Comrade deputies!

There are spheres of activity in which one must not resolve issues by the method of voting where economic

calculation is required. They should be removed from political struggle. This is primarily the question of measures aimed at improving finances and monetary circulation and stabilizing the ruble. This is the pivot of the whole anticrisis program.

As in 1922, today the question is: "If we manage to stabilize the ruble—we have won, if not - we have lost." If there is no stable ruble opening access to purchasing various goods, then there will be no stimuli for production and, consequently, we will not succeed in stopping economic recession, let alone in ensuring economic growth.

The shortages will continue to grow.

No government can implement a program unless it is provided with appropriate financial resources. We intend to use all possible means to resolve this problem, and we expect no thanks for it. We do, however, have a right to count on understanding.

According to the results of the first quarter, the situation that is emerging in regard to the Union budget, the Union economic stabilization fund, the social welfare fund, and other Union funds is, as I have said, catastrophic. This is no exaggeration.

I declare in all responsibility that the government will not settle for such a situation. But we do also realize that we will not rectify affairs only by the forced procedure of exacting payments. What is needed is a package of measures and concerted decisions.

Finances and money circulation are the ground beneath our feet. While this is swaying, the steps will be timid. Various measures, including unpopular ones, are needed to strengthen it. The whole of world practice, and Soviet practice too, testifies to the fact that we cannot manage without them. We are laying bare this problem in full awareness.

There are two fundamentally different variants of the solution, both of which we examined. The first involves within a short space of time sharply cutting all state expenditure, including the social programs that have been adopted, and increasing taxes to eliminate the budget deficit.

At the same time bank interest rates would be sharply increased and money supply restricted and income frozen by any means.

As a result of this, inflation would be halted and price increases would be stopped, but production and the population would at the same time be subjected to a strong deflationary shock. Production output would be reduced even more and unemployment would grow sharply. The level of the population's consumption would fall, too. There are sufficient examples of this throughout the world. We cannot embark on such an option.

The second option provides for the complete liberalization of prices and the lifting of all restrictions on an increase in wages and other incomes of the population. The tax system is being restructured in such a way that by utilizing increases in prices and incomes we can balance the budget and on this basis in the final analysis create preconditions for stabilizing monetary circulation.

However, this option in fact means spiraling inflation, which will have a devastating effect on production, undermine credit, make investment unprofitable and hit people's living standards with a new force.

The real choice that we have made is that of maneuvering between these ravines, without falling into any of them, combining with this objective measures from the two alternative options. This is the path of controlled inflation, and what is set out in the action program is oriented to such a path.

I hope that everyone will understand that it is possible to get through it with minimum costs only by reacting flexibly and operatively to the trends that are developing in the national economy, and with unity and precise coordination of action at all levels of authority and administration.

What specific measures does the program propose in this decisive area? In the first place it is necessary that we firmly and finally agree on the Union budget system, on the demarcation of revenues and expenditure between the Union, republics, and local bodies, and on a strict finance and payments discipline.

We support the proposal by the Russian Federation on developing extraordinary quarterly Union, republic and region budgets with the aim of maximum cuts in expenditure or freezing it, which evidently will be sufficient in conditions of inflation. It is envisaged that corrections taking into account to the growth of prices will be made only on a limited list of so-called protected articles of the budget connected with the financing of expenditure on social needs. For the rest resources must be expended only strictly in accordance with revenues received.

The government is prepared to seek further reserves of cuts in expenditures, including military expenditures. We understand that this is a most difficult question, but a way out must be sought. On this level a program of conversion of military production must also be reexamined. The republics and local bodies must for their part show maximum responsibility and keep within their limits.

Since today budget deficits are funded with credit by the central banks, and this is one of the biggest channels of money issues, we deem it necessary to establish strict limits by mutual agreement for such credits and to ensure their rigorous observance.

The dramatic nature of the moment lies in the fact that for many decades we were accustomed to tutelage by the

state, to the fact that the state can do anything and is obligated to everyone. But today we are forced to reject this flawed practice, and the present Cabinet of Ministers has to shoulder the indignation caused by this.

Economic laws are unavoidable: if we want to have low prices maintained by subsidies and to spend large amounts on social programs—more than two thirds of all budget expenditure is spent on these purposes—then they should be defrayed by taxes. There is no other way out and no other source. In connection with this, I must comment on one important point in the program: "From 1992 to implement the reform on turnover tax, to abolish sales tax and to change over to value added tax and the excise system." It is of key importance to financial improvement.

The essence of the matter is that it is possible to balance the budget and to stop financing budget expenditure by printing money in the conditions of possible price rises only in cases when the sources that increase automatically together with price rises and increases in the income of the population would prevail in the budget revenues. This is the practice worldwide. Turnover tax, sales tax, and value added tax are precisely such sources.

That is why the sales tax which caused such a strong wave of criticism was introduced at the end of last year. I must admit that there was our usual lack of organization and incompetence, mistakes were made, and speculative aspects were added in this matter. How, where and why did this tax appear? Here, in this hall, when it became clear that there was no money for new pensions and assistance to mothers, as many people were saying earlier. The question arose whether abolition or sharing out should prevail. We decided to share it out. How? Let he who purchases more and dearer things be the one to pay. Hence the tax as a percentage on the value of the goods acquired, from all consumers with the exception of those for whom it is actually destined. The republics were therefore instructed to establish a list of socially significant goods and everyday services to be exempted from taxation. But some republics were late doing it, others included such a wide range of goods and services that the whole thing is meaningless. Instead of following the USSR Ministry of Trade's instructions for price lists to include the tax, the trade network started calculating it on all goods at the cash desk. Things had to be put right on the run, although that does not make it any easier. I would like to reach understanding today on another issue, however: if we want to strengthen the ruble, overcome the deficit, halt the flow of worthless paper money, then we need a tax of precisely this type.

We intend to make a tangible reduction in the profit tax, and in a number of other deductions, to replace the sales tax with an analogous value added tax, and to replace the turnover tax by excise duties; and to exclude from salaries, profit, and other taxable incomes those funds allocated for redemption of enterprises, acquiring shares, investments and payment of credits granted for these purposes. In other words, to transfer to the taxation

system accepted in the majority of developed European countries, to switch the main part of the tax to those who consume more. Furthermore, if prices rise, and budget expenditure with them, then the revenue from these taxes will increase along with the rise in prices. This will make it possible to balance the budget and obtain funds to implement the social welfare programs. An automatically operating anti-inflation mechanism will thus be built into the budget system.

Comrade deputies! I think that it is also necessary to express our viewpoint on the problems of attracting foreign capital. Very little has been done on a practical level here, but it has caused more than enough of a stir. Let us look into this. A policy to construct an open type of economy has been embarked upon, that is to say, our country needs to actively participate in world economic links and in the international division of labor. The Western markets are open and we have an interest in working there. But then one's internal market also needs to be gradually opened up. Not only the goods market—it does not exist in isolation—but the finance market, the loan capital market, the labor market, and the intellectual property market.

Speaking of attracting foreign capital, in the first place we must look to the future. It should not be the purchase of meat and butter or running shoes and perfume abroad that should concern us, though we need them at present, but rather the establishment of a competitive environment. The country needs the most up-to-date technology, modern equipment, ecologically clean production, know-how, and experience. We need to create a civilized infrastructure and to expand services. This is where the experience of developed countries is indispensable. We should not think that they will run full tilt to us to invest money. This is an illusion.

The government considers that a targeted, comprehensive program for attracting foreign capital needs to be drawn up. We need to define in the order of priority for investment and to establish a system of incentives and guarantees. Only then can we count on tangible assistance and positive results.

It is in no way a matter of selling off Russia or turning it into a colony. There is no need for fear; this needs to be done competently. The United States remains the strongest integral power, in spite of the fact that probably half of its companies, banks, and firms belong to other countries of the world.

Who of us will be worse off if, over the next year or two, hundreds of foreign hotels and thousands of vehicle servicing centers, restaurants and cafes are built? Do we really not have an interest in the creation of a powerful food or medical industry? All of this can be achieved in a short time and one does not need to look far for examples.

We have thousands of tonnes of most valuable foodstuffs perishing in industrial dumps, millions of cubic meters of timber rotting, and the country is crammed with scrap

metal, at a time when there is a very acute shortage of all these resources. But it has to be said directly and openly: We ourselves are not up to it; we do not have the equipment or the technology; there is no time, the sense of being the master has not been stirred. But they are ready, and moreover on terms favorable to both sides. So is this really the selling-off of one's native land? No, when one looks at it this way, it is the saving of that land. We are deeply convinced that preconceptions have to be discarded—it is time to operate on a grand scale and competently.

Finally, the last thing to which I would like to draw particularly close attention. This is probably the main thing both in the program and in the government's own activities. I am talking about two-way relations with the republics. About relationships of a new form.

The new Cabinet of Ministers realizes perfectly well that the center cannot remain what it used to be. Our inter-relations have to be changed in practical terms.

In developing the program the Cabinet of Ministers proceeded from the position that the system of managing the economy in contemporary conditions should be based on the new role of the republics in the Union's state structure, and the rational distribution of powers between the center and subjects of the federation in the interest of all.

For this reason the program envisages joint coordinated activities to get the country out of the crisis and this is an immutable condition for achieving the end result. It is impossible to view the program as some kind of blueprint into which we want to fit the activity of all the subjects of a renewed federation. We acknowledge that the republics that will bear a significant portion of the burden in implementing the anticrisis measures will implement them in accordance with and taking account of the economic and sociopolitical situation actually taking shape both in the country and on their own territory.

It is senseless and harmful to seek to do everything by command from the center. Although naturally, without coordination of the policy and practice of implementing the program, and clear organization on the scale of the whole country, it will also prove impossible to restore the national economy. The government intends to act energetically and decisively within the scope of precisely those powers that will be delegated to it by the republics.

It is precisely for this reason that I regard it as my duty to stress again and again that on all the key issues we will opt only for solutions that have been agreed upon with the republics.

Moreover, I will say frankly that, even before signing the treaty, we calculated on reaching a common denominator. Have a look at the appendix to the program. There is a whole package of new draft agreements there. Surely

someone's ambitions and personal enmity toward members of the Cabinet of Ministers will not again prevent us from taking steps to meet each other halfway?

A program, no matter how wonderful it might be, cannot be realized by any government if it does not obtain the broad support of the Supreme Soviet and the public forces. We are counting on such support, but we must also reckon with the fact that a regrouping of such forces is taking place in the country. That is why we are looking toward the increasing role and significance of the trade unions, the voluntary associations of enterprises of various branches of the national economy, the creative union, and other progressive sociopolitical movements.

However, I will state quite plainly that the Cabinet of Ministers does not intend to play to the gallery in a quest for popularity and recognition; we are firmly resolved to implement the measures we have mapped out, although many of them may seem extremely harsh. The government is ready for dialogue, it is open for cooperation and a search for compromise solutions with any factions, parties, and movements. All constructive proposals and comments that we have received have been or will be taken into consideration. Just as will those that we receive during the course of parliamentary hearings of the program.

The main thing now is productive work and a high degree of responsibility on the part of each citizen. We are committed to doing everything possible to get our factories and works, blast-furnaces and mines, power plants and transportation operating at full capacity so that people have the incentive to work and faith in tomorrow.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers appeals to the people, public organizations, and movements to close ranks and consolidate their forces for the normalization of the life of the country. Work must be done; the country is in danger.

### Political & Social

#### Gorbachev Meets With Nine Republic Leaders

LD2304142991 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Konstantin Voytsekhovich, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev is currently meeting leaders of the nine republics that are going to work on a Union treaty. The meeting is being held at Novoye Ogarevo near Moscow, presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

He said presidents or heads of government from Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Turkmenia and Azerbaijan were present at the meeting.

According to Ignatenko, they are focusing on the draft Union treaty, economic problems and other current issues.

Russia is represented by Chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin.

#### Republics' Interparliamentary Conference Ends

LD2304092291 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1859 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Yuriy Kozman]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Apr (TASS)—The establishment of direct ties and coordinated action by representatives of groups opposing communists in the Supreme Soviets of Union republics are the main results of the first Interparliamentary Conference, which ended in Moscow today. Taking part in its work were representatives of the legislatures of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Estonia—10 of the 15 Republics of the USSR.

Summing up the results of the forum at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists today, Aleksandr Yemets, a Ukrainian people's deputy and one of the Interparliamentary Conference organizers, noted that of the documents adopted during its work it is worth singling out the conference statute that regulates its operation and determines its aims and tasks. In his opinion, also topical were proposals to hold a "round-table" involving representatives of various political trends in the USSR, the statement supporting the workers' strike movement, and the appeal by the Interparliamentary Conference to the country's political forces "to start a campaign of civil disobedience, going as far as organizing a general political strike" in the event of a state of emergency being declared in the USSR.

In the opinion of Russian People's Deputy Vladimir Lysenko, one of the organizers of the forum, the Interparliamentary Conference had provided an opportunity "not only to learn the positions of various groups and factions in the republics' legislatures but also to take the first steps to unite forces opposing communists with the workers' strike movement."

It was announced at the news conference that the forum has set up a Council of Representatives, which will work on a permanent basis.

#### Pavlov on Soyuz State of Emergency Appeal

PM2304164391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
24 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1,3

[Report by legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "Choice of Priorities"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] On 22 April, immediately after presenting the anticrisis program to the Union

legislature, Prime Minister Pavlov attended a news conference for Soviet and foreign correspondents accredited at the USSR Supreme Soviet. To the credit of the head of the Cabinet of Ministers, he did not duck even the toughest questions.

Does the present government know how to achieve stability in the economy? Yes, the prime minister replied, but we want to do it on a legal basis.

What does he think of the appeal by the "Soyuz" deputies' group for the introduction of a six-month state of emergency? Pavlov said that he considers the "Soyuz" program to be correct on two counts: A special regime has to be introduced in certain regions and sectors.

Will the Army be used to impose a state of emergency? No, people cannot be made to work by force, the premier believes, but they can be given the opportunity to work. But the Army is not needed for that; the law-enforcement organs will suffice.

Pavlov has his own view of the strike problem, as well. He reminded journalists that the previous government had submitted a draft law on strikes for the Supreme Soviet's consideration, but the legislature had adopted a completely different law, on labor conflicts, in the belief that there are no and cannot be any political strikes in the USSR, since they can never happen. Therefore the current strikes are not subject to the law, therefore they are indeed of a political nature.

How does the prime minister view the idea of a round-table? But who do you sit at it with? Pavlov answered the question with another question. With Yeltsin, for example, was the suggestion. That is not my problem, was the Union cabinet head's confident reaction.

#### **Ignatenko on State of Emergency Introduction**

*LD2304152391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1404 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Konstantin Voytsekhovich, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—[passage omitted] Moving on to answer questions, Vitaliy Ignatenko touched, in particular, on the demand at last weekend's congress of the "Soyuz" parliamentary group for an extraordinary congress of USSR People's Deputies to be convened and for the USSR president to report to it. Noting that to convene a congress in current conditions "would be untimely and do little to further progress," Vitaliy Ignatenko highlighted definite disagreements within this parliamentary group. He announced that several of its members have already expressed disagreement with certain decisions and with the procedure by which they were adopted at the group's congress.

Answering a question about the possibility of introducing a state of emergency in the USSR, Vitaliy Ignatenko noted that the USSR president "would not

wish to resort to such measures." In any case, according to him, the president would not make such a decision on his own. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, Vitaliy Ignatenko announced that the USSR president intends to deliver a report on his visits to Japan and the Korean Republic at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

#### **Predicts Gorbachev Criticism at Plenum**

*LD2304203891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A very important briefing was held in the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry today. I would like to say a few words about it. It was conducted by the USSR president's press secretary, Ignatenko. He said that the most important event of the week was the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which opens tomorrow. He reported that on the agenda of the plenum were two points, two questions. Valentin Pavlov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and prime minister, will deliver a report on the question of the situation in the country and ways of extricating the economy from crisis. The plenum will also discuss the question of the work of communists in soviets of people's deputies. The report on this subject will be made by Valentin Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Replying to questions from the journalists, the head of the president's press service stated that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expects this plenum to produce a very serious, constructive, and honest dialogue, which the participants in the plenum will conduct in a quite sharp and impartial manner.

In the opinion of the president's press secretary, at the plenum quite a number of critical remarks and speeches could be leveled at Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as general secretary. Gorbachev is ready for this, Vitaliy Ignatenko noted, and is looking forward to this plenum with a feeling that it is necessary.

Replying to a question from a Greek journalist on whether Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev does not consider that the time is ripe for his departure, Gorbachev's press secretary noted there exist in the world many presidents where one figure, one person combines in his hands both the post of the leader of some political party and the post of head of state. On the other hand, Vitaliy Ignatenko said, one is aware of the attack by the party apparatus, the so-called conservative forces in the party, on the general secretary. One feels, one senses that the party apparatus wants, as it were, to take revenge for 1985, to take revenge for the fact that the conservative forces are today, as it were, on the fringe of the historical process.

The president's aide expressed certainty that wholesale criticism of and attacks on the leader of the USSR would not help matters and undoubtedly would not extricate the country from the crisis. But, summing up, Vitaliy Ignatenko noted that he had been expressing his personal point of view of the problem and that this point of view should not be ascribed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev personally.

#### Attacks on Gorbachev, Plenum Outcome Eyed

PM2304213591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
24 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

["Political Diary" article by Valeriy Vyzhutovich: "Vanguard at a Turning-point?"]

[Text] It has to be admitted that, since the 28th congress, the public's attention to events in the CPSU's life is not what it used to be. Debates in the Union parliament, political passions in the Russian legislature, rallies, and strikes occupy people's minds almost totally. Therefore it is all the more noticeable that interest in the upcoming party plenum is very high. The reason for this is not just the crisis which the CPSU is experiencing, the existence of divergent views within the party, and their clash, but also the talk about the possible (or impossible) resignation of M. Gorbachev from the post of head of the Soviet Communist Party. V. Ivashko's official statement that it is not envisaged to discuss this question at the plenum has only provided additional pretext for conjectures, forecasts, and different interpretations.

Dissatisfaction with the work of the general secretary can be sensed not just in the moods and utterances of rank-and-file party members but also from high-level rostrums—in the speeches by republic and oblast party leaders. "The crisis which is gripping the country has now reached its apogee," B. Gidasov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom [oblast party committee], said at its plenum. The reason for "the country being involved in an experiment on an unprecedented scale," according to Boris Veniaminovich's perception, lies "in the unforgivable passiveness and inconsistency of the CPSU leadership" and of M. Gorbachev personally. The general secretary was also subjected to sharp criticism by the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee plenum. Ukrainian Communists' leader S. Gurenko declared after the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum that M. Gorbachev should not combine the top posts in the party and the state since he is not coping with the duties of general secretary. A joint ahead-of-schedule plenum of the Krasnodar CPSU Kray Committee and its Control Commission called for an extraordinary plenum to be convened to hear communist M. Gorbachev's account.

In this call "General Secretary to account!", which is ringing out almost everywhere, it is possible to sense a craving for "organizational conclusions." There is no denying that the personal responsibility of the ruling party's general secretary for the course which he is

steering and the results of this course is great and indisputable. Unfortunately, the leader of Soviet Communists has furnished more than enough grounds for criticism for inconsistency and indecision. I do not know how other people feel about this, but I am more saddened than pleased at the drift toward this sort of "analysis" which first made itself felt with the slogan of the Leningrad rally which everyone remembers: "Politburo to account!" All this has happened before in our history. By anathematizing former leaders (criticizing present leaders is only a recent development), who were said to have led us in the "wrong" direction, it was emphasized that party leaders may, on occasion, be wrong, the party never. Therefore the arrows of criticism were always aimed at individuals. And today again, the gist of the speeches which rang out at obkom and republic Central Committee plenums was something along these lines: The party cannot be held responsible for the mistakes and miscalculations committed by its leadership.

Let us try and work out who else also bears responsibility for the policy implemented by the CPSU, and not the least share of it, to put it bluntly. Yu. Belov, secretary of the Leningrad Party Obkom, said from the plenum rostrum: "In our political assessments and in defining the policy we have renounced the social-class method of studying social life and social phenomena... And the policy of pseudocentrism which is being implemented by the general secretary has given the anticommunist forces a free range."

As you can see, an attempt is made here—and this is not the first time—to revise one of the most fundamental precepts of the document adopted by the 28th congress—that of the priority of universal human values. The congress program statement bears the seal of a necessary and sensible compromise between various ideological streams within the CPSU, but it seems that this is precisely what irks those who tend toward the "trench" spirit and the ideology and practice of dividing people into "ours" and "not ours."

Until very recently, the party press more often than not attributed the decline of the CPSU's prestige to intrigues by "destructive forces." Today some people are prepared to attribute it also to M. Gorbachev's indecision as general secretary. However, are not anticommunist moods provoked and people with antiparty slogans brought out into the squares by the delay of reforms, the attempts to revise the 28th congress decisions, and the support by some republic party organs for illegal salvation committees?

Up to a point it is possible to understand the participants in the Leningrad Obkom Plenum who declared that "the party, lacking specific Central Committee positions, has essentially found itself alienated from the elaboration of the leadership's socioeconomic course, and has become hostage of its numerous insufficiently thought-out and inconsistent actions." However, it seems to me that the general secretary himself is to an equal extent hostage of

a certain frame of mind which prevails in leading party circles, and which he must heed whether he likes it or not. And this frame of mind is by no means in tune with what is happening today in the streets and the squares and outside party offices. Therefore, it is becoming increasingly difficult for M. Gorbachev to meet the demands of the political moment without the risk of rejecting equally tough demands made by many of his influential comrades-in-arms in the party leadership, or more precisely those of them who see the way out of the crisis which has hit the country in an edict economy, in uniformity of ideological thought, and strongarm methods of management.

Criticism of M. Gorbachev is also coming from another side. He is being criticized for inconsistency in the implementation of the course toward the market, for foot-dragging in the destatization and privatization of property, and for his "lukewarm" attitude toward the democrats. The existence of a left wing in the CPSU once again demonstrates how tricky the situation is for the general secretary, and how difficult the plenum debate will be. It seems possible to predict that the plenum will mark a turning point for the party. But a turning in what direction? Toward decisive and consistent steps capable of leading the country out of the impasse? Or toward "entrenched" resistance against the crucial demands of life? Incidentally, there is no time to indulge in either optimistic or pessimistic forecasts. Let us hope that the plenum participants have a responsible understanding of this.

#### **Rostov Proposes Plenum Vote on Gorbachev**

*LD2304224491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2110 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A decision to put a vote of no confidence in the general secretary on the agenda of the forthcoming Central Committee plenum has been made at a plenum of the Rostov Oblast CPSU plenum. This information was received by telephone from our Rostov-na-Doni correspondent.

#### **Gorbachev Neglect of Party Work Worsens Crisis**

*PM2304080991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent V. Cherepanov: "Position Defined"]

[Text] Chelyabinsk, 19 Apr—The participants of today's Chelyabinsk CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom] plenum expressed deep anxiety in connection with the mounting crisis in the country and party, the collapse of the economy, the declining living standard, and the growing confrontation among political forces. How destructive these processes are is graphically exemplified by the area that is the main "buttress of the state." In only the first three months of the year the oblast has failed to supply

consumers with goods worth more than 150 million rubles [R], steel smelting has fallen by hundreds of thousands of tonnes, and production of rolled steel and steel pipes has declined. The continuing miners' strikes are not only paralyzing the metallurgical enterprises but are bringing the implementation of social programs to the brink of disaster.

Advocating the stabilization of the social and political situation in the country and oblast, the obkom plenum urged all political parties and movements to refrain from strikes, rallies, and other similar actions until the end of the year. It is necessary to seek and find points of contact for actions in the people's interests. A resolution was adopted expressing resolute disagreement with the Union and republic governments' approaches to the reform of retail prices and social protection of the population. The major increase in the cost of goods and services, the paltry compensation—given, as a rule, at the expense of enterprises—and the five-percent purchase rather than sales tax are pushing the bulk of the population over the poverty line and are condemning the badly off strata to hunger and suffering. The oblast soviet communists who are USSR or Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies were told to take a legislative initiative on reviewing these decisions.

The obkom plenum participants believe that the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum will reveal the real reasons for the failure of the perestroika plan and name those who are party to it. The authority of the CPSU, which initiated perestroika, has been undermined. A lack of attention to affairs in the party and to the work of the Politburo on the part of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is aggravating the crisis within the party. Supporting the appeal by a Leningrad Obkom plenum, the south Urals Communists advocated the earliest possible convening of an extraordinary party congress.

#### **CPSU Nationalities Commission Meets**

*LD2304214191 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Commission for the Nationalities Policy held a session on Tuesday.

The session, presided over by Party Secretary Andrey Girenko, discussed the results of examination of republics' laws on sovereignty and practical measures to guarantee human rights, as well as a mechanism of legal protection of ethnic minorities as regards their representation in bodies of power at all levels.

Representatives from party committees informed the session about their experience in meeting national and cultural requirements of ethnic minorities.

**Ivashko Meets With Government Communists**

PM2304102591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
18 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meeting With Communists"]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met in the Kremlin 17 April with communists who work in the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet Secretariat and USSR Government.

Ivashko described the situation in the country and the party at the present stage and answered questions from those present.

The meeting was dedicated to the 121st anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth.

**Dzasokhov Says Party Under Great Tension**

LD2304165191 Moscow World Service in English  
1600 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee is calling a full-scale meeting tomorrow to consider the situation in the country and within the party. One of the items on the agenda is the participation of communists (?in) the councils of peoples' deputies.

A Political Bureau member and Central Committee secretary, Aleksandr Dzasokhov, has said in an interview with Radio Moscow the party is living through a great political tension. The party understands its responsibility for the situation in the country primarily in the economic area and ethnic relations.

**Gorbachev Said To Lack Lukyanov Support**

AU1904130991 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER  
ALLGEMEINE in German 19 Apr 91 pp 1,2

["W.A." report: "The Struggle for Power in the USSR: KGB and Generals Against Gorbachev"]

[Excerpt] Frankfurt, 18 April—In the struggle for power in the Soviet Union, hard-pressed President Gorbachev seems to be threatened by the loss of support from a man who has so far been one of his most intimate friends, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Lukyanov. Referring to a conversation with Lukyanov a few days ago in the Kremlin, a well-known member of the Russian People's Deputies Congress told this daily that the chairman of the legislature no longer supports Gorbachev's policy, but, as Lukyanov himself put it, he is about to "look for alternatives." Lukyanov's search is allegedly supported by former Premier Ryzhkov, who is not exactly reform minded, as well as by influential forces among the generals and the state security organs of the KGB. [passage omitted]

**Arguments for Gorbachev Ouster Criticized**

PM2404095591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
23 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

["My Opinion" article by Anatoliy Karpychev: "President Parting Company With General Secretary?"]

[Text] Moscow does not believe in tears, but it does believe in rumors. It must be said that worrying rumors are sweeping Moscow. Of all sorts. They claim that Gorbachev's days in high party and state office are numbered—he is himself planning to quit. Certain newspapers hinted before his visit to Japan that he was setting himself apart and not allowing others access to him—and not without reason. Then there came the report about the CPSU Central Committee plenum scheduled for 24 April, which will discuss the situation in the country and, it is claimed, relieve Gorbachev of his duties as general secretary.

If only it were just Moscow that was hit by rumors... The radio station "Deutsche Welle," for instance, reported the other day: "Gorbachev intends shortly to give up the party leadership. This raises the question of whether it is possible at all—and all the more so now—to run the Soviet Union without or even despite the party and its apparatchiks."

Well, "Deutsche Welle" is a small consideration compared with our own prophets and analysts. After familiarizing myself with the arguments of G. Starovoytova at the "Global Panel" international congress in Amsterdam it suddenly struck me that that perhaps the question of the two posts is indeed of global importance, and I am failing to understand something. After all, she was not making an aside when she said: "The combination of the two posts—that of president and that of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—is a tragic circumstance for President Gorbachev, although it was inevitable in order for him to stay in power. But nobody in history has ever managed to be the Pope and Luther at the same time. Moreover, I think that it would not have occurred even to Luther to send tanks into Catholic Lithuania."

Nonetheless, let's leave the Pope, Luther—who never knew about tanks—and Starovoytova in peace, since they have nothing to do with the post of general secretary. I, for instance, can see no "tragic circumstances." I know of many enlightened states where the combination of posts in the shape of a single individual is an entirely normal occurrence.

From what I have seen, politicians gain their strength from belonging to a party and having that party's support. Naturally, I am not only talking about the Communist Party. Presidents and premiers often emerge from party ranks onto the public scene. Francois Mitterrand is a Socialist, Ronald Reagan and George Bush are Republicans, FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl is chairman of the Christian Democratic Union, British Prime Minister John Major is leader of the Conservative Party. One

could mention Felipe Gonzalez, the head of the Spanish Government. He is secretary general of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party. Yes, certain presidents do leave their party (the Italian Francesco Cossiga, for instance) but they do not lose touch with it and continue to support it.

So let's not be naive when people try to tell us that heads of state belonging to a party is some great crime, as if they would reflect general national interests more fully without it. How shall I put it... On the contrary, it seems to me that it is through their parties rather than through their offices that politicians have an opportunity to gain a better insight into their people's interests, concerns, and worries. And, when times are hard, a party of like-minded people serves as the first support for—or, if you like, a sensible critic of—a president or premier. But it is not an executor. I do not think that it is just for amusement that Gorbachev's political opponents are today forming something akin to a democratic party with Yeltsin as its *de facto* leader.

But why have the flames suddenly flared up again around the combination of the posts of Central Committee general secretary and USSR president? Why have there been rumors before the plenum that the president wants to part company with the general secretary? Who needs this and why? Why is the issue even being exported to Amsterdam? Let's think. In any political struggle fires like this are not lit by chance, and pointless work is something nobody needs. Let's look at the situation.

The situation is explosive. In my opinion, there has never been anything like it before. The words "the fatherland is in danger!" have been voiced not just by the fainthearted. The USSR president, speaking recently in Khabarovsk, recognized the danger himself. This, alas, is not a rumor but a bitter reality.

The claim that "our motherland is in danger" can also be heard in addresses by party committee secretaries from hero-cities. Shortly before the CPSU Central Committee plenum, they assembled in Smolensk where the document in question was elaborated. Impressive forces—Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk... The attempts against our motherland are not coming from outside, as has happened before in history, attempts to break it apart are being made from inside using your hands and ours... This is also said in the address.

Who is making the attempt? The general secretary? Yeltsin? Polozkov? Who is being censured?

An AP correspondent has concluded: "Judging by everything," he notes, "this censure is aimed both against Gorbachev and against his reformist opponents headed by Yeltsin."

All this is very serious.

We have somehow gotten used to the fact that the political opposition (B. Yeltsin) has imposed on society a

merciless struggle for power at a most difficult time. It is also well known that the opposition has made its choice in demanding Gorbachev's resignation. But the fact that Communist Party members have taken such a malicious and frenzied stance against their own leader is something new, albeit not unexpected.

It is impossible to overlook or ignore the mood of party circles. And this mood obviously did not develop only yesterday. I well recall a PRAVDA article from the Ukraine, filed by our own correspondent N. Mironov under the headline "Nostalgia for Stagnation?" At that time, dissatisfaction with the policy of perestroika and the general secretary was probably heard for the first time at a meeting of the Zaporozhye party aktiv. He had deprived, it was claimed, the party apparatus of its privileges, of the center's favors, and of its confidence, and had subjected it to a cleansing process... Evidently, by now this wave has gained a certain dynamism and strength. Here are fresh facts from the selfsame region: It was said at gorkom [city party committee] plenums in Krivoy Rog, Dnepropetrovsk, and Dneprodzerzhinsk (places closely associated with Brezhnev, by the way): "Communists are distancing themselves from the policy pursued by the general secretary and president..." To continue: During a conference at the Dnepropetrovsk obkom [oblast party committee], which brought together the first secretaries of party raykoms [rayon committees] and gorkoms, someone already proposed that the general secretary's portrait be taken down from the wall, someone else proposed that he be sent to trial. All this was dubbed elaboration of a stance for the Central Committee Plenum in Moscow. Approximately the same situation prevailed at a Sverdlovsk party gorkom plenum—lack of confidence in the general secretary was expressed, as it was in several raykoms in Moscow and other cities.

The meaning?

In my view the party apparatus is yearning for revenge... for its defeat during the initial years of perestroika. The party apparatus, just like the "democrats," is taking advantage of the economic difficulties.

Despite the fact that both wings of those who are dissatisfied with the president and the general secretary consider each other either to be a brake on perestroika or the destroyer of the Union, they have suddenly found themselves in an affectionate embrace.

Where are these "joint" efforts leading? I think that someone will gain a considerable advantage from this "compromise." To all intents and purposes communists are voluntarily helping the political opposition to remove Gorbachev. Of course, not all the party is doing this, but the split is obvious.

...We have never known feelings to run so high and it is frightening. But while communists are running scared and attacking their general secretary, the other side is strengthening its political initiative and looking for ways to influence people. All the more so since, in this

explosive situation, the road to the miners' or other hearts has become far shorter.

The crisis in the party aroused by April 1985 is clearly dragging on. Who gains by it? Clearly not the communists. Opposition leaders have scored plenty of points and some of them have even made glittering careers out of mercilessly criticizing and even abusing the CPSU. The opposition knows what it wants. Judging by certain opposition moves, it can look somewhat further ahead in the "chess game" than certain "iron" communists. These people clearly believe that either removing the general secretary's portrait or bringing him to account would get the party out of crisis. Unfortunately, this has already been tried: People have condemned, stigmatized, and removed portraits... The "democrats" do not remove portraits. They are campaigning for the "Polish option." This option is more serious than the removal of a portrait.

We very much like to quote foreign models and foreign options. What is the "Polish option"? Not the Romanian option, but specifically the Polish option? If we are to be frank, it is a "soft" way of getting the president's resignation and removing all previous structures, including the party. Unlike "party" critics, the opposition acts more subtly.

I would like to note that there is much that is instructive in the Polish option... Instructive for presidents too. While Wojciech Jaruzelski was leader of the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] it seemed to me that he was in charge. Of course, everything changes. On 19 July 1989 he was elected president. Just 10 days later he was relieved of his post as first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee at his own request. The party then disbanded. Lech Walesa, the opposition leader, reassured public opinion: No, he had no aspirations to the presidency in the near future. A year later Walesa was elected president.

In my opinion, there is no need for any commentary on this. We need only recall the words of Mieczyslaw Rakowski, who replaced Jaruzelski as first secretary of the Central Committee: "God forbid you go the Polish way."

Our Soviet opposition deliberately wants to go this way. Certain communists are calling for us to embark on it, without even fully realizing just what it's all about. Even though it is all extremely simple: It is about burying the general secretary, the president, and the party.

Fashionable among the "democrats" today is the thesis of a "roundtable" or "coalition government." The idea has been put forward by the Russian leader, essentially proposing a peaceful change of the "political system." That is the assessment of those who think likewise. The idea meshes with their formula that supremacy in the country should be held by the Federation Council without the USSR president but with Russia having virtual supremacy within it. It is said that the formula is being transformed. I admit it. The "democrats" believe

that the "roundtable" in Poland resulted in an open sesame... What enthusiastic demonstrators and the "lords of the squares and streets" were unable to achieve before should now be achieved by a "roundtable" and strikes. Strikes will allegedly make the center more amenable.

Whether Communists like it or not, the opposition looks tactically more flexible, sophisticated, and agile. It is rapidly restructuring itself as it goes along. In February B.N. Yeltsin resolutely said: "I have made this choice, I will not turn from this course." But today it seems that he is prepared to turn slightly off course and modify his choice. Admittedly, he is not rejecting confrontation. The West is noting that he is rather afraid of the "hard-line" party apparatus and does not want to appear to them as someone fighting for power.

The party "hard-liners" are also calling for unity and consensus. But how? Without Gorbachev as general secretary and president? OK, let's suppose that he goes. Then what? Is it true that nobody is indispensable? But the party simply does not have any alternative at the moment... The following could happen: First we'll remove our own head, then we'll start missing our hair, and again start pleading for salvation...

Why am I so pessimistic?

First, we are very adept at getting ourselves desperate and into extraordinary situations, and then proudly saying how heroically we overcame our difficulties. Second, we are continually being hampered by someone "from within." Personally, I would save the fatherland not from a president who holds the post of general secretary, but from something else. From the thirst for revenge. From irresponsibility. From the malice and hatred desiccating the social organism. From the political illiteracy and credulity of people who are clearly taken in by—pardon the expression—political tricksters. After all, many "leaders" called for a "no" vote on referendum day. The majority of the people voted "yes." The people and these "leaders of the people" had diverged on the most important point. I repeat—the most important point. And what came of it? Nothing. Nobody resigned, nobody asked the people's forgiveness.

I hope that nonetheless the people will very soon raise their voices. I have been reading letters responding to the articles "Attack on the President," "Will History Find the Sinners?" and "Do the Russians Want War?" They are very different. Some writers support the president unconditionally, seeing him as the embodiment of legislative power; others have serious complaints about him, which is also natural. I can understand the writers' sharpness and pitilessness: They have to shoulder all the burdens of life. And there can be no question of our president being above criticism. But I cannot understand those communists who are keeping quiet and dreaming of revenge.

The party has been through a great deal over the past six years. Its most zealous critics today recognize that there

are many sensible and smart communists. These are not the kind of rumors that have been sweeping Moscow on the threshold of the Central Committee plenum. Admittedly, it is a pity that things are sometimes controlled by another section of the party—or rather an element—which ultimately costs the party very dearly. In my opinion, this element is in a rush to remove (change) the portraits in party offices. There must be no rush.

#### **TASS Reviews Central Press for 24 Apr**

*LD2404064191 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT  
24 Apr 91*

[“Soviet Press Review”—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—Most stories in today's newspapers focus on the domestic economic crisis and ways to overcome it.

PRAVDA opens its front page with a joint statement on measures to stabilise the situation in the country signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin and leaders of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

The restoration of constitutional order and enforcement of laws is crucial for stabilisation, the statement says.

The signing of a new treaty between the Soviet republics is a priority, it says.

The Soviet parliament on Tuesday endorsed the key provisions of a government programme to pull the country out of crisis, newspapers report.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN publishes a report by Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov to the parliament in which he presented the new anti-crisis programme.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA publishes extracts from Pavlov's speech.

The government proposal envisages a sharp reduction in budget spending, stiffer control on bank crediting of state expenses, privatisation, measures to promote small businesses, a moratorium on strikes and several other tough administrative measures.

The 18-point plan of emergency measures in the programme highlights the cabinet's new economic policy, TRUD writes.

The Russian parliament discussed privatisation of state property on Tuesday, newspapers report.

Both the government programme and an alternative proposal suggested handing property over to Russian citizens free of charge.

The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, which opens in Moscow today to discuss the situation in the country and ways to overcome the economic crisis, is this week's major event, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments on rumours that Gorbachev could be forced to quit the post of party general secretary at the plenum.

“Radical communists” plan to derail the government anti-crisis programme at the plenum because it rejects administrative-command economics, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports.

Newspapers publish President Gorbachev's decree abolishing a resolution by the Armenian Government to nationalise property belonging to the Armenian Communist Party and Komsomol as “violating the USSR Constitution and laws”.

PRAVDA comments on the miners' strike. Strike committees are increasingly involved in politics, PRAVDA writes comparing the strike with the 1989 stoppage.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA says that Vorkuta miners are determined to press their political demands.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries comments by Aleksandr Afanasyev on perestroika.

The Soviet Union could face an energy crisis within the next two years, the newspaper writes, commenting on the situation in the oil and gas industry.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA blasts the Russian draft law on presidential elections in the republic.

The Damar Italian Firm and the Soviet KGB public relations centre have agreed to make a 13-part film series about KGB, TRUD reports.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes that contracts for geological prospecting between Mongolian and Soviet partners have been cancelled.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an interview with chief of the Afghan Army Political Department Manoki Mangal.

#### **Yakovlev Warns of Civil War Danger**

*LD2204113191 Berlin ADN in German 1040 GMT  
22 Apr 91*

[Text] Hamburg (ADN)—Mikhail Gorbachev's chief advisor, Aleksandr Yakovlev, has warned of civil war in the Soviet Union. In an interview for the latest edition of the Hamburg-based magazine STERN, which is published on Thursday, he stressed that “the danger comes from the right and the dangerous people are in the apparatus of the Russian Communist Party. They openly say that perestroika has lost its way.”

Yakovlev said that he is frightened that the policy of reform will fail. Orthodox communists are again in the process of looking for enemies. It is starting again with cries of “dark forces and of the threat from imperialism.” Stalin had set up his rule in this way.

However, Yakovlev also criticized the radicals from the other side. They would shout "Down with the CPSU, Communists against the wall, and put the party on trial." An end must be put to such slogans. In Yakovlev's view, all parties and nonviolent groups should have the right to exist in a democratic society.

In the interview, Gorbachev's chief advisor and closest confidant expressed the opinion that even Gorbachev should not use violence to put his policies into effect. "Democracy cannot be defended by force. It must defend itself. Anything else is absurd," Yakovlev conceded that he had not counted on with such strong opposition to perestroika. The fate of the policy of reform will be decided in the coming three or four months.

Yakovlev called on the West to increase support for the line of reform taken by Gorbachev. The reserve and policy of wait and see by Western countries benefits the orthodox right because such forces are using the bad social and economic situation to their advantage. In the future, investors from the West must risk more.

#### **Perestroika Roundtable Speakers 'Radical'**

PM2304155191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[V. Khatuntsev report: "Only Accord Will Save Us"]

[Text] Why are the results of particular perestroika processes so ambiguous and contradictory? Why is the transition to the market so painful and still unverified? What is society to expect in the very near future if we fail to achieve civil accord?

A debate on these and other important topics took place in the Oktyabrskaya Hotel's conference hall 20-21 April. The "roundtable" "Perestroika in the USSR: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" was organized and conducted by the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Editorial Board, the international nongovernmental organization "National Accord" Committee ("Rome Movement"), and also the independent "Washington-Paris-Moscow" University.

The discussion participants did not conceal their political views, the diversity of assessments, or the differences in their view of our country's prospects—from communist to capitalist, and even with variations in the style of underdeveloped Latin American states. It was this that imparted a unique nature to the discussion, particularly, as you yourselves will understand, because politicians and scientists such as V. Bakatin, G. Popov, Ye. Ligachev, S. Shatalin, R. Khasbulatov, G. Yavlinskiy, and others had something to say.

The problems of our development have been bound together so tightly that it is impossible to reform some one sphere separately from another, and transformations must embrace politics, the nationalities question, and the economy simultaneously.

True, after familiarizing yourself with the list of speakers, you were left with the impression that it was mainly reformers of a radical tendency and active market advocates who were invited. And so the debate was confined to the interests of the speakers, particularly economists. But, had people with more cautious views been in the hall, we certainly would have heard counter-arguments. But in this case play was all in the same direction, and with quite caustic political commentaries. Nevertheless, a lot was said about the pressing need for a dialogue of all social forces.

G. Yavlinskiy spoke well of this when reflecting on power: It is necessary to begin the talks process after elaborating the concept of this process. The idea of a "roundtable" will no longer pass, and we should remember that all wars end in talks, even if it is a question of capitulation. Can one avoid going to war just once...

In his message to the participants in the meeting, even though he attended it, the writer Vladimir Maksimov, cochairman of the "National Accord" Committee ("Rome Movement"), reflected with alarm on what is happening in the world and wrote: "Therefore I am convinced that we have just one way out—a dialogue, however agonizingly hard it might be. Alas, no one will offer us a different globe, and we are doomed to live alongside each other. In this fatal proximity we will be forced either to reach agreement in the end or to bite through each other's throats. So we have little choice. And whether we will survive on this Earth at all depends on what triumphs among us—reason or emotion."

A sober warning. For, in order to understand, it is necessary first to listen. Only accord will save us.

#### **IZVESTIYA on Perestroika Roundtable**

PM2404132991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
23 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by I. Demchenko under general heading "How To Avoid Catastrophe?": "Politicians' Roundtable: On Path of Civil Consensus"]

[Text] A conference—a politicians' "roundtable" on "perestroika in the USSR: Yesterday, today, tomorrow"—organized by the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, the "National Consensus" ("Rome movement") committee, and the independent "Washington-Paris-Moscow" university was held in Moscow 20-21 April. Taking part were eminent politicians of our country like V. Bakatin, Ye. Ligachev, N. Petrakov, G. Popov, R. Khasbulatov, S. Shatalin, and G. Yavlinskiy and also a group of experts from Washington's Cato Institute headed by E. Crane, the institute's president.

Of itself the idea of such a conference did not initially generate any particular enthusiasm: The weakness of a gathering of well known people is precisely that their positions are well known beforehand. It was all the more of a surprise to hear, for instance, the statement by G.

Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, on the need to introduce for the period of transition to the market an intensified regime of administrative power with rights to restrict the powers of representative organs of all levels and to suppress the population's excessive demands for social guarantees.

It was no less of a surprise to hear the words of V. Bakatin in support of the "life-giving force of socialist ideas" and his appeal to the experience of Ye. Ligachev, who was sitting nearby, in "organizing" milk yields, the harvesting of agricultural produce, or the clearing of railroads: "He only had to say something once and the entire country would do it. The system worked irrefragably." Or, for instance, the not trivial coincidence of views of Ye. Ligachev and the radical economist L. Piyasheva with regard to the fact that there are only two paths for society's development and attempts to find a third path are undoubtedly doomed.

All these and other similar examples serve as proof of what complex and painful internal processes are taking place in society and in each one of us and how many more dimensions they have than those labels which we have already managed to attach to parties, movements, and people.

Those taking part in the conference stressed that they were voicing their personal viewpoint. But no "declarations of independence" could camouflage the fact that each person was expressing the stance of a quite wide circle of like-minded people and that often prevented him from waiving convictions even in small matters. It is not hard to imagine how much more complicated that talk would have been if the official leaders of various avenues of social thinking who believe themselves even formally linked by commitments to their fellow fighters had been sitting at the table.

At the same time it is becoming increasingly obvious that it is essential to seek ways of bringing positions closer. Our country, as S. Shatalin rightly said, is so unique that it does not permit the application to itself of ready-made models of reforms carried out in similar circumstances in Europe, the Near East, or America. Our own experience also bears this out convincingly enough.

In a country where there are so many different ethnic groups, so many religions and beliefs, such a high degree of polarization of views and convictions, so many sovereign republic-states, it is impossible to implement a reform which fails to consider all these circumstances. And, as G. Yavlinskiy noted, there are many signs that it would be wrong to reckon that our parliaments and some progressive leadership or institutions of a newborn democracy can independently and successfully resolve all the necessary tasks.

What we have already grown accustomed to call a "crisis," he said, is in fact a far more complex and serious process. A crisis is a phenomenon within a system, a phenomenon which, however protracted and agonizing it may be, does not affect the foundations of

the system, still less demand its complete transformation on all avenues, right up to raising the question of the state's possible collapse, the change of the social system in it, and so forth. Incidentally, there have already been similar periods in our state's history and not once has Russia emerged from such situations with dignity, in such a way that our heirs could be proud of the decision of their ancestors. That is another reason why it is so important to seek an actual way out of the situation and to set up dialogue, despite all the complexities in organizing it caused by the implacability of positions, mutual distrust, and other factors.

Those taking part in the conference stressed that so far there cannot even be talk of some "roundtable," although they themselves used precisely this term, obviously for want of a better one. They could hardly count on it being easy to gather at the same conference table the exponents of all positions and official and informal leaders. And even if this undertaking on a cosmic scale does succeed there may be no result because, as S. Shatalin noted, recently many people have lost the skills of conducting dialogue and have begun to speak almost exclusively in monologues. If that continues, society will be deprived of its last hope—the possibility of compromise.

Therefore it would be obviously correct today to engage in elaborating the concept of the policy of the negotiation process. G. Yavlinskiy said that the interrepublican center for economic and political research founded by members of the "500 days" program working group is now studying precisely that problem. In their opinion the basis for initiating the negotiation process could be agreement on those points which are considered absolutely unacceptable for society: tolerating bloodshed, hunger, and violence, especially violence on a state scale—between republics, for instance. At the center of discussion the authors of the concept suggest introducing global questions—like nationalities policy, the economy, local conflicts, and so forth.

Of course, during the conference many of the participants are analyzing the present state of the country and the immediate prospects which await us. Here the assessments given by economists were virtually identical, differing only in trivial details. The hiking of the spiral of prices and incomes growth which has begun will lead in the very near future to very powerful inflation. It will be combined with production stoppages caused by various reasons, the main one being inflation itself and the tragic situation with regard to the import of raw material and subassemblies for all industry, especially enterprises of the agro-industrial complex.

The rising swell of prices combined with the shortage is already exasperating the population, but exasperation will be substantially intensified when people are convinced that prices are not stopping but growing further. By the middle of the summer this will give rise to very great tension and if by that time society has not been offered a sensible alternative tension will most likely

move from regulated meetings and statements involving mutual recriminations in the press by leaders of various avenues to a qualitatively different plane when virtually all working people will actively join the process of ascertaining relations.

The end of the summer is obviously the borderline when it will still be possible to resolve the problem by intellectual means. Then people will begin to adapt to life under the conditions of inflation, losing their last faith in the possibility of reform. After that happens we may get a huge nuclear power on whose territory no laws operate other than the laws established by the local mafia, as in some Latin American states.

The assessments of the situation given by N. Petrakov, S. Shatalin, V. Selyunin, and L. Piyasheva stressed the extremely limited time left for reforms. In this connection many scientists agreed that no political declarations which fail to consider the real potential of the economy and the republics' sovereignty will lead to a way out of the present situation. The only truly market measures proposed by the government—the liberalization of prices and the repeal of control over individual incomes, N. Petrakov believes, are nothing other than a statement of the situation which has already taken shape and, not being backed up by financial stabilization, are leading the country toward hyperinflation.

In such situations the governments of national consensus operating in an atmosphere of trust can, for instance, appeal to the people to be patient for a while, limiting their demands to the budget's real potential. Here the absolute majority of speakers stressed that today there is no force, party, or group in the country capable of forming such a government single-handedly. Such a government can be attained only on the basis of universal consolidation and on the basis of the understanding that the transition to the market demands fundamental political changes to the structure of society and it is impossible to do without these changes.

Perhaps the only person at the conference to clearly formulate a different position was Ye. Ligachev, whose program is to restore in society faith in genuine scientific socialism and in the fact that we can emerge onto the road of progress by our own efforts. In his opinion two forces are really capable of leading the country out of the crisis: the CPSU and strong, renewed soviets. The ultimate goal is seen by him in the form of building a communist society and the presence in society of supporters of this viewpoint must obviously also be considered.

#### **Trade Union Body Calls Off Warning Strike**

LD2304164791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network 1540 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] The Moscow-wide warning strike planned by the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions [MFT] for the eve of 1 May has been postponed. This was announced to a

TASS correspondent by the MFT organization department. The demands of the capital's trade unions advocating peace, civil accord, and the satisfaction of working people's economic demands seem to be meeting with a response in the Moscow Soviet and the Union parliament, with which appropriate talks were held yesterday. In the next few days it is planned to hold a similar dialogue with the USSR Supreme Soviet.

#### **Sverdlovsk Plant Takes Poll on Party Committees**

LD2304195891 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk April 23 TASS—A poll on the dissolution of party committees on the factory floor was conducted today at the Uralmash machine-building plant in Sverdlovsk.

The workers' collective council and the administration of the plant have granted 40,000 roubles for this purpose.

Workers have to reply the following proposal: "To dissolve Soviet Communist Party Committees and their functional services on the factory floor and do not lease or provide free of charge or on any other basis premises at the plant, the administrative building or the scientific and research institute Tyazhmash to any political associations and parties for their bodies and functional services".

The dissolution of party committees on the factory floor has been lately widely discussed at many industrial enterprises in Sverdlovsk region.

Last year, about 60,000 communists quit their membership in the Soviet Communist Party, while the share of communists among workers shrank from 30.9 to 23.5 per cent.

#### **Sverdlovsk Situation Termed 'Critical'**

PM2304090191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[“Direct Line” report by Aleksandr Pashkov: “Urals: Situation Becoming Critical”]

[Text] Sverdlovsk—While Sverdlovsk City Soviet deputies debate endlessly, the situation in the city and the oblast is becoming critical.

Sharp price rises have plunged 60 percent of the citizens of Sverdlovsk into a state of shock. Almost one-half of families are already starving or are undernourished. Compensation to the sum of 60 rubles [R] today constitutes only 20 percent compared to the average wage. Initial estimates indicate that the minimum consumer basket, which cost R304 at the beginning of the year, has now risen to R626.

These figures were cited at a recent plenum of oblast trade unions that met to determine its stance vis-a-vis the outbreak of strikes at metallurgical and mining enterprises in the oblast.

In heated debates the Sverdlovsk trade unions decided to express solidarity with the main demands of the miners and steelworkers.

#### Official Denies Prison Camp Restoration

LD2304195491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak  
Network in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Inflated rumors have recently been appearing in certain publications, citing foreign and Soviet information sources, to the effect that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is restoring prison camps, or building new ones, in Siberia, Yakutiya, and Kolyma. In connection with this, a spokesman for the USSR Main Administration for Correctional Affairs stated that such reports do not correspond with reality: They are aimed at disinformation of public opinion and are also provocative.

#### Blockades Trap Rail Freight in Krasnodar

PM2304104991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
18 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

["Emergency Situation" report by correspondent K. Aksenov: "Deadlock of Their Own Making Reduces People to Despair"]

[Text] Krasnodar Kray—Today the already overloaded railroad stations are impossibly overcrowded. Thousands of passengers are whiling away days and nights in incredibly difficult conditions, waiting for the Georgian authorities to give the "green light" on the tracks leading to the Transcaucasian republics.

Imagine, every day nine passenger trains travel the coastal branch line alone. Today they are all standing at stations along the shores of the Black Sea.

"We now have three trains on the tracks," P. Kozeyeva, deputy chief of Adler Station, told me. "They're the trains to Tbilisi, Yerevan, and Sukhumi. People are waiting. I don't know when they will continue their journey. Yet many people are traveling on urgent official business, on vacation passes. There are passengers with children, and old people. Everyone you talk to is indignant that some people are making a railroad boycott a means of political struggle."

"What are the local authorities in Adler doing?" I asked Polina Petrovna.

"Since we don't know when traffic will be allowed through, we are telling people outright: There's no point waiting, you must seek other means of reaching your destination. Buses are standing expectantly on the square in front of the station; they can take passengers to Sukhumi and other population centers in Georgia. Some

people are going by air or by sea. But, unfortunately, many are *unable* to leave. So, they are fretting at the station..."

This is not the first time a complex situation of this kind has developed through the fault of the neighboring republic, and local soviet and party organs at Sochi, Adler, Tuapse, and other railroad junctions have now gotten accustomed to these deadlock conflicts. Special staffs have now been set up to promptly resolve problems that arise. The main one being not to leave people in trouble. Yet there are thousands of them. Everyone has to be given shelter, food, and attention. The people of Sochi are not becoming flustered. Food stocks are small, but foodstuffs have been allocated for passengers stranded en route and trade in the most essential commodities has been set up.

The freight flow situation is also complex. There are now dozens of trains carrying various commodities, materials, and food standing idle at stations. Adler Station is virtually paralyzed, with several trains standing idle on its tracks. What is to be done? The freight cars are carrying freight that attracts light-fingered people. Theft is possible. Who will be responsible for this?

Finally, Krasnodar Kray is losing vast amounts of money and incurring irreparable losses due to recent similar bottlenecks, and the normal rhythm of people's lives and the functioning of the main transportation arteries are being disrupted. This is having an adverse effect on the kray's economy. But who will compensate for the losses? The people of the Kuban say bluntly: It is finally time to call strictly to account those people who are taking decisions they are not entitled to take that exacerbate relations between republics which quite recently lived in friendship and mutual understanding.

#### Success Claimed for Joint Patrolling

LD2204182491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak  
Network in Russian 1510 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Interview with Colonel General Boris Vsevolodovich Gromov, first deputy minister of internal affairs, by Anatoliy Fedorov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] A roundtable on problems of preserving public order was held in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs today. It was attended by the heads of the relevant militia units of the republics, krays, and oblasts of the country. [passage omitted]

[Fedorov] Is there any need to say yet again that people now do not feel themselves completely safe in the streets, in their everyday lives, at work? Figures were given today: One crime in six or seven is committed in the street, one in four or five in public places. It is nearly three months now that the joint decree of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of defense on joint patrolling has been in force. How would you evaluate this period?

[Gromov] You know, when I was still at military school—that was a long time ago—I remember that at that time there was joint patrolling in some towns. At that time we were still small, but somehow even then people had a more robust attitude to this question than now, although at that time, in the 1950's, the situation on the streets was not so good. Perhaps it was a little better than today, but it was difficult. That is one thing. Another thing, I should like to say that this question, and the fuss made about joint patrolling, I would say, has something to do with politics, since there is a fight for power—everyone can see this and understand it very clearly—and then suddenly you get this decree. Is not this decree another encroachment on democracy, is it not a return to some dictatorship or something of the sort? You see, there are not many militia, and joint patrolling increases the number on the streets.

[Fedorov] What about the results? Three months have gone, almost.

[Gromov] In many regions, according to the republics themselves, the results are good. In any case, in many towns, including towns in Siberia, the Volga area, the center of Russian and not only of Russia but also of the Ukraine, people themselves are saying that since the decree was brought in it has become possible to go home from the evening show at the theater or cinema in peace. I will not quote figures for those detained, I think this is not really the point, but the actual appearance or existence of a joint patrol in the streets even in the dark has a comforting effect on a normal person. [passage omitted]

### Economic

#### Gorbachev, Presidents Adopt Anticrisis Measures

PM2304224591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
24 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1

[Joint statement signed by M. Gorbachev, USSR President; B. Yeltsin, RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman; V. Fokin, Ukrainian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic) premier; V. Kebich, Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers chairman; I. Karimov, Uzbekistan president; N. Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan president; A. Mutalibov, Azerbaijan president; A. Akayev, Kyrgyzstan president; K. Makhkamov, Tajikistan president; S. Niyazov, Turkmenistan president: "Joint Statement on Immediate Measures To Stabilize the Situation in the Country and Overcome the Crisis"]

[Text] The crisis in our society continues to deepen. Society is torn apart by social and interethnic conflicts. Production decline is worsening. Living standards are falling, and the supply of the most essential goods to people is in jeopardy. There are serious breaches of law and order and discipline in the country. The most acute problems which have been building up for decades, the

painful difficulties of the transitional period, and the mistakes committed in the course of perestroika have all come to a head.

The USSR president and the leaders of supreme state organs of the Union republics of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan, having discussed the situation in the country at their meeting 23 April 1991, deemed it necessary to immediately implement coordinated actions.

First. The meeting participants believe that the adoption of resolute measures to restore constitutional order everywhere and the unconditional observance of laws currently in force, until the new Union treaty and a Constitution of the Union are adopted, are an absolute condition for stabilizing the situation in the country. Union and republic organs of power, local soviets and executive committees, officials in all organizations and enterprises, and citizens must proceed from this premise in their activity.

Second. The paramount task for overcoming the crisis is the conclusion of a new treaty of sovereign states taking into account the result of the all-Union referendum which has been held. In this context, the meeting participants deem it necessary:

- to complete in the immediate future the work on the draft new Union treaty so that the agreed document could be signed by delegations of the aforementioned republics;
- not later than six months after the treaty has been signed, to prepare and adopt at a Congress of USSR People's Deputies a new Constitution of the Union whose basis must be provided by the provisions of the treaty on the Union of Sovereign States;
- after the new Constitution has been adopted, to prepare and hold elections for Union organs of power as provided by the treaty and the Constitution;
- normal operations by Union and republic organs of power and by soviets of people's deputies at all levels must be ensured throughout the transition period;
- the supreme leaders of Union republics participating in the meeting, recognizing the right of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldova, Georgia, and Armenia to autonomously decide the question of joining the Union treaty, at the same time deem it necessary to establish a most-favored-nation regime for the republics which have signed the Union treaty within the framework of the single economic space created by them;
- discrimination along nationality lines, the fanning of interethnic conflicts, and violations of the rights of USSR citizens wherever they may live are impermissible. All such occurrences must be resolutely terminated by law enforcement organs.

Third. To confirm the obligations of Union bodies and republics enshrined in the economic agreement for 1991

and the need for their unconditional fulfillment, primarily as regards budgets and the formation of extrabudgetary funds.

There was unanimous support for the implementation of joint anticrisis measures, taking the exacerbated socioeconomic situation into account.

It is necessary to ensure further intensification and development of economic ties between enterprises, regions, and republics, and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Union republic governments will bear greater responsibility for this.

With a view to stabilizing the situation in the country's national economy, the meeting participants advocated the introduction of a special work regime in industry's base sectors, at enterprises producing consumer goods, and in railroad transport.

Whenever necessary the republics' organs of power will adopt additional measures ensuring the national economy's normal work.

The meeting participants believe that the provision of foodstuffs for the population is the paramount task. Central and republican organs will implement coordinated actions to fulfill the planned deliveries of material resources to agriculture and the agro-industrial complex enterprises. During the second quarter, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Union republic governments must elaborate and adopt decisions on the maintenance of equivalent relations between agriculture and agro-industrial complex enterprises and the other sectors of the national economy.

Fourth. Recognizing that not all the factors having a negative effect on the population's living standards were taken into account when implementing the retail price reform, the meeting participants deem it necessary to adopt a series of additional measures in the interests of social protection for citizens, especially those on low incomes. Specifically:

- to abolish the 5-percent sales tax on goods in daily demand. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the republic governments must compile a list of these goods within one week;
- the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the republic governments must within two weeks examine the real situation concerning prices and adopt coordinated decisions on the questions creating the greatest social tensions;
- measures must be taken to compensate higher prices in students' cafeterias and school canteens, and to review downwards the new rates in railroad and air transport;
- a decision on the indexation of incomes must be adopted within one month.

Bearing in mind the aforementioned agreed decisions, the leaders of the Union and the republics address miners and all working people with a call to halt the

strikes for economic and political reasons and to apply efforts to make up for the losses in the immediate future.

Fifth. Taking into account the exceptionally acute crisis situation in the country, the leaders of the Union and the republics perceive as intolerable the attempts to attain political goals by incitement to civic disobedience and strikes or by calls to overthrow the existing and legitimately elected organs of state power.

They advocated cooperation and collaboration between all social and political forces within the framework of the law, utilizing the opportunities offered by the development of democracy, the activity of representative organs of power, and glasnost.

Moreover, it was especially emphasized that, at the present crucial time, the interests of the people, the practical work to extricate the country from the crisis, the continuation of democratic transformations in society, and the further radicalization of economic reform with simultaneous implementation of measures for the population's social support must be the paramount goal.

The meeting participants are aware that all these measures to stabilize the situation and overcome the crisis would be unimaginable without a radical enhancement of the Union republics' role.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, USSR President; B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Premier V. Fokin; V. Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers; Uzbekistan President I. Karimov; Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev; Azerbaijan President A. Mutalibov; Kyrgyzstan President A. Akayev; Tajikistan President K. Makhkamov; Turkmenistan President S. Niyazov

#### Jan-Mar Economic Performance Surveyed

PM2304134791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
22 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "The Economy in the First Quarter—USSR State Committee for Statistics Report]

[Text] A USSR State Committee for Statistics report states that the results of the first quarter testify to the country's extremely complex and contradictory economic situation. Crisis phenomena embrace practically every sphere and sector of the economy. Compared to the corresponding period last year, gross national product has fallen by 8 percent, generated national revenue by 10 percent, productivity of social labor by 9 percent, and there has been a sharp fall in investments, while the volume of import-export operations is down by a third. The production of industrial consumer goods and agricultural output has begun to fall.

A critical situation developed in the consumer market: Panic buying intensified, particularly toward the end of the quarter, shortages spread to all types of consumer

goods, and speculation increased. A net increase in sales turnover was achieved almost wholly by dint of price increases. The population's living conditions have deteriorated.

The drop in production is connected with the deterioration of the provision of resources for the national economy which is plagued by the destruction of economic links and by mass stoppages by enterprises because of a lack of raw materials and semimanufactures, because of the disruption of deliveries in the co-production sphere, strikes, and interethnic conflict, and for ecological and other reasons.

The increasing complexity of the country's socioeconomic situation is largely caused by the strengthening of inflationary processes and the depreciation of the ruble. The budget deficit has become potentially disastrous as a result of the nonfulfillment by a number of republics of their commitments regarding the formation of the Union budget revenue, and this has led to major difficulties in financing the national economy and very important nationwide social programs.

The report continues: It is possible to suppose that the ubiquitous reduction in business activity highlighted by the results of the first quarter will continue further, and assessments of economic projections by enterprises and organizations for this year support this supposition.

Enterprise forecasts for industrial output in the current year are approximately 10 percent below the actual level for last year. Projections for the production of many types of agricultural output are significantly reduced.

In the January-March period the overall volume of industrial output, evaluated in comparable prices, fell by 5 percent compared to the corresponding period last year, and by 6 percent in March. The reduction in industrial output has affected all national economic complexes.

In the last period of the year, output in agricultural enterprises fell. In general, for the country as a whole in the quarter that has just elapsed the value of agricultural products fell by 13 percent compared with the same period last year. It is the first time in recent years that such a level of decline in output has been witnessed. The volume of output of livestock products fell sharply, as did the purchase of cold-frame, hothouse, and early vegetables from open soils, and this had a negative effect on the state of the country's consumer market.

This year, forward contracting agreements between agricultural enterprises and procurement organizations cover only a reduced volume of purchases as follows: livestock and poultry—79 percent of last year's volume of purchases; milk—87 percent; eggs—a mere 47 percent; and wool—66 percent. Contractual agreements for the sale of grain to the state cover only 73 percent of last

year's level of such purchases grain requirements. Percentages for other products are as follows: oil-seed crops—75; raw cotton—69; sugar beet—76; potatoes—98; vegetables—83 percent.

Because of the lack of commodity resources, the systematic use of goods from wholesale and retail trade reserves is under way, the volume of which was reduced by 11.8 billion rubles [R] (14 percent) in 1990 alone and by the beginning of 1991 it was R17.8 billion (27 percent) below prescribed normatives. In connection with the situation on the consumer market which has become more complicated and the catastrophic upsurge in panic buying (just prior to the 2 April introduction of new prices) a further R5.4 billion worth of goods reserves was used for trade in the first quarter, and in one month alone (March)—R3.4 billion worth.

The USSR State Committee for Statistics goes on to point out that in the state sector the number of employed people has fallen, which is connected to a certain extent with the development of various forms of ownership and economic activity. The overall number of managerial personnel in the country stood at 15.7 million people at the beginning of 1991, which includes the 1.6 million people who comprise the organs of state and economic management. The basic mass—14.1 million people (90 percent) work at the lower management levels—directly in plant management or on the shop floor of enterprises and organizations.

In the first quarter, the loss of working time due to strikes totalled 1,169,000 man-days, including 573,000 in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and 577,000 in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In March there was a sharp increase in the number of strikes in the coal industry.

Implementation of the Union budget in the first quarter has been shaping up decidedly unsatisfactory. According to preliminary figures, revenue totalled R21.3 billion (39 percent of the planned figure), expenditure—R48.2 billion (73 percent of the plan), deficit—R26.9 billion, under an approved deficit limit of R26.7 billion for the year. The deficit was covered by means of bank credit resources. Such a situation is explained on the whole by the fact that certain republics are not maintaining their contributions to the Union budget as envisaged by the Agreement for 1991 to Stabilize the Country's Socioeconomic Situation.

The profits of enterprises and organizations in the January-February period are estimated to have totalled around R45 billion and increased 1.4 times compared to the corresponding period last year in connection with the rise in wholesale prices.

Calculated over one month, each worker has an average spending power of around R300. This total is made up of 95 percent wages and 5 percent various individual one-time social benefits, as well as various payments, made according to the results of the year's work, and lump sum incentives. In addition, around R11 billion was paid out

to the population in March, including R8 billion to those at work, and R2.2 billion to pensioners, by way of safety net compensation for additional expenditure in connection with the rise in retail prices and tariffs.

Compared with the first quarter of 1990, per capita income for workers and service personnel increased by 19 percent to R203 per month, and by 24 percent to R179 per month for kolkhoz workers.

The population's expenditure on acquiring goods and paying for services (consumer expenditure) increased by 25 percent, mainly owing to price increases and paying over the odds to acquire goods and receive services at speculative prices which are 2-3 times higher than state prices.

In the first quarter the increase in consumer goods prices has accelerated considerably. Compared with the corresponding period for the previous year they increased by 20 percent in January 1991, 27 percent in February, and 30 percent in March.

The consolidated retail price and tariffs index for consumer goods and paid services to the population, which is calculated on the basis of recording prices of representative goods (services) and which also takes account of the effect of prices in city cooperative trade organization stores, on the kolkhoz market, cooperatives' output, and individual labor activity alongside the change of prices in state trade, rose by 123.8 percent over last year's figure in the first quarter of 1991, of which goods accounted for 125.9 percent and services for 109.2 percent.

Now turning to the state of the consumer market. The prevailing situation with regard to consumer goods output is not improving. Over the period January-March industry produced consumer goods, including alcoholic drinks, worth a total of R129.7 billion (in retail prices), which is R3 billion or 2 percent less than the corresponding figure for the same period last year. According to the first quarter results, output of food products was down 6 percent compared with the corresponding period in 1990.

The production of alcoholic drinks in the first quarter of 1991 stood at 32.7 million decaliters (expressed in terms of pure alcohol), or 2 percent more than in the corresponding period of the previous year.

Output of nonfood goods for the population (minus light industry items) increased in comparison with the first quarter of 1990 by R1 billion.

The value of light industry goods output was R29.9 billion, which is R2.6 billion (or 8 percent) less than the same period last year. Production of practically all the most important articles manufactured by light industry is down.

In March the consumer market was characterized by a catastrophic explosion of panic buying. In the second half of the month, prior to the introduction of new

prices, all goods were literally "swept off" store shelves. In March, goods worth R52.3 billion were sold to the population, which is R14 billion or 36.5 percent more than March last year.

Compared with the same period last year, in the first quarter the sale of meat and poultry, fish products, butter, cheese, nonalcoholic drinks, and vegetable and fruit juices was cut by 14-26 percent, confectionery and sausages, dairy products, potatoes, vegetables, margarine, and eggs were cut by 6-12 percent, sugar by 3 percent, and tea sales remained at the same level as for the corresponding period of the previous year. Grain product sales were up 7 percent, vegetable oil, fruit and citrus fruits were up 15-20 percent, and canned meat 50 percent.

The supply of food products to the population has been considerably strained by the disruption of the economic ties between regions. Thus, in the first quarter the quantity of meat products dispatched to Moscow fell short of planned volumes by 14 percent, Leningrad was short by 16 percent, Moscow Oblast by 27 percent, the Azerbaijan SSR by 17 percent, the Turkmen SSR by 36 percent, the Republic of Georgia by 25 percent, the Uzbek SSR by 50 percent, the Tajik SSR by 61 percent, and the Republic of Armenia by 73 percent.

Contractual commitments to deliver meat products to the all-union stock were on the whole fulfilled 110 percent, dairy products 87 percent, and eggs 72 percent. Compared with the first quarter of 1990, meat product delivery to the all-union stock was cut by 49,000 tonnes (the Ukrainian SSR and Moldova SSR cut delivery by almost a half, the Lithuanian Republic by two-thirds); dairy product delivery was cut by 502,000 tonnes (the Ukrainian SSR reduced deliveries by more than half, the Belorussian SSR cut deliveries by a third); egg delivery was cut by 506 million items (three-quarters of the reduction in delivery is due to the Ukrainian SSR).

Over the three-month period the quantity of potatoes that came into the trade network was 133,000 tonnes (8 percent) less than last year, the quantity of vegetables was 180,000 tonnes (11 percent) less, and as at 1 April reserves of these products were down by 39 and 23 percent respectively on last April's level.

The USSR State Committee for Statistics lists alarming statistics about the state of the environment. Over this period the organs of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology established that air pollution by certain substances in 50 industrial centers was 10 or more times above permitted norms (the figure was 53 centers in the first quarter of 1990). These included major cities like Arkhangelsk, Volzhskiy, and Bratsk, where in 1990 high levels of methyl mercaptan were noted, Saratov and Krasnoperekopsk, which are polluted by hydrogen chloride, and Berezniki and Gubakha (in Perm Oblast), which suffer from hydrogen sulfide pollution.

At 213 water installations there were 827 cases of high-level pollutant concentrations; moreover, these were

most frequently recorded in the basins of the Ob and its tributaries the Irtysh and the Tobol (26 percent of all cases), the Volga, the Oka and the Kama (20 percent), the Don and the Donets [Severskiy Donets] (8 percent). On certain sections of these rivers concentrations of oil products and of compounds of zinc and of nitrogen (in the form of ammonium salts and nitrites) were 50 times greater than norms permit.

The USSR State Committee for Statistics survey ends by summarizing the dynamics of foreign economic links. In the January-March period, the overall volume of import-export operations in real prices stood at 34.3 billion foreign currency rubles and has fallen by 33.8 percent compared to the corresponding period last year. Because of the drop in the output of industrial products and the limited export resources in the fuel and energy complex, the overall volume of the country's exports was 18.4 percent lower than the corresponding period last year, totalling 17.9 billion foreign currency rubles. The limited nature of the hard currency receipts from the sale of goods abroad has led to a 45.1 percent reduction in the purchase of imported goods, the total volume being 16.4 billion hard currency rubles.

The difficulties arising in foreign trade activity with CEMA countries, connected with the new forms of payments (in freely convertible currency), resulted in a 40.9 percent fall in exports to these countries and a 48.3 percent fall in imports. The trade operations with capitalist countries are characterized by a 10.7 percent fall in export deliveries and a 45.2 percent fall in import deliveries.

In the first quarter, imports of ferrous metals fell by 957,000 tonnes, those of pipes—by 303,000 tons, natural rubber—21,000 tonnes, poultry meat—33,000 tonnes, butter—45,000 tonnes, citrus fruits—20,000 tonnes, coffee—6,000 tonnes, tea—23,000 tonnes, and sunflower oil, by 38,000 tonnes. The reduction in the import of foodstuffs had a negative effect on the country's consumer market.

### Vorkuta Rally Fails To Back Strike Call

PM2304085391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
20 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by Yu. Medvedev: "Tired of Doing Nothing"]

[Text] Vorkuta—Three of the 18 mines in Vorkuta were fully operational 18 April. They are the "Vor-gashorskaya," "Yuzhnaya," and "Ayach-Yaga" mines. Another three mines were partially operational. Less than half the planned amount of coal was obtained on that day. But shipments of coal to consumers increased considerably. They are close to the planned level. In fact, 1,000 tonnes more coking coal than planned was sent to the Cherepovets Metallurgical Combine.

Miners' collectives are looking for a way to establish a normal production rhythm. At a rally held the day before on Peace Square a call for a strike at other enterprises did not meet with mass support. The rally was over pretty quickly. One felt that people were tired of living in conditions of fruitless discussions and inactivity.

### Cooperatives Union To Support Miners' Strike

LD2204134491 Moscow World Service in English  
1200 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] The strike of coal miners in different regions of the country has been going on for over six weeks. They advance economic and political demands, for example the setting up of a coalition government of people's confidence.

They have been supported by the Soviet Union of Cooperatives, which included an agreement with the Interregional Council of Workers' Strike Committees. The document notes that the end of the strike without its goals achieved would mean defeat of all the economic forces. The Union of Cooperatives is going to set aside for gradually distributing among the striking miners over 100 million rubles.

Meanwhile, the central council of the Coal Miners' Trade Union has requested the international coal miners organization to render its financial aid to the tune of \$2 million.

## Baltic Republics

### Estonian Supreme Soviet Amends Labor Law

*LD2304225591 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1310 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn, 23 Apr (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of Estonia has removed the word "alternative" from the text of the law on regular labor service for the residents of the republic, and also the reasons for which young men from Estonia cannot carry out their service duties carrying weapons, i.e. their state of health, religious and moral convictions, and others.

This law was adopted by the Estonian Supreme Soviet in April 1990. At the same time the Estonian legislature unilaterally declared the service of the republic's residents in the USSR Armed Forces to be illegal, and the USSR law on "On Universal Military Duty" as not subject to unconditional fulfillment on the territory of Estonia.

Amendments to the law were proposed by Deputy Kaydo Kama, who represents the left-radical grouping "Congress of the Citizens of Estonia" in the parliament, which advocates the restoration of the Estonian Republic in its 1938 form.

State Minister Rayvo Vare asked the deputies to refrain from supporting the proposals of K. Kama as they could reduce to nothing the very essence of the alternative nature of regular labor service. But during the vote it was precisely these amendments that received decisive support.

The law "corrected" in this way makes regular labor service no longer alternative, but the only lawful one for the residents of Estonia. At the same time military commissariats, governed by the Union laws and subordinate to the USSR Defense Ministry, continue to function in Estonia as before. Sub-units of the department for defense and border control, which are being set up at the local self-governing bodies, will be working in parallel with them. They will carry out their own registration of conscripts. And by no means just to replenish the ranks of the labor front soldiers. Draft laws "On Defense" and "On Setting Up Forces of the Estonian Republic for Self-Defense" are in the legislature at various stages of examination.

According to the opinion of sober-minded deputies, all this could lead to further exacerbation of the war between republic and Union laws.

### Latvia Not Planning Independence Steps

*LD2204190491 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT  
22 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga April 22 TASS—Latvia is not planning to make resolute steps towards independence, like Lithuania.

The republican parliament's agenda for this week does not include debates on omitting a transitional period for restoring independence, from the declaration on sovereignty.

The Lithuanian declaration has no such a provision, and it announces Lithuania a state outside the Soviet Union. Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis proposed approximating positions of the three Baltic republics, rejecting a transitional period. He drafted a document and submitted it to a Baltic Council session on April 13.

Latvian and Estonian Presidents Anatoliy Gorbunovs and Arnold Ruutel failed to sign the document, saying that only republican parliaments could change the republics' status and declarations.

In a week after the meeting, Landsbergis' idea failed to be supported by Latvian and Estonian legislative acts. In Lithuania itself, the parliament is facing opposition supporting a stage-by-stage progress towards independence. Various opposition political forces criticise the Lithuanian parliament's confrontation with the Soviet Union.

### Pavlov, Latvian Premier View Economic Relations

*LD2304185691 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian  
1730 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] Here is a report prepared by the government's information service.

There was a talk today between Ivars Godmanis, prime minister of the Republic of Latvia, and Valentin Pavlov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. They discussed and analyzed questions connected with the economic and financial relations between the Republic of Latvia and the USSR in 1991.

The future development of the relations will be specified in joint talks by the Finance Ministries of the Republic of Latvia and the USSR in their talks. [sentence as heard]

### Report Cites Gorbunovs Interview

*PM2404085191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
23 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2*

["Direct Line" report by Irina Litvinova: "Independents, Unite?"]

[Text] Riga—The Latvian Legislature press center has issued an interview with Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, on some details of the recent meeting of leaders of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In particular there was a debate on the question of possible joint actions by Georgia, Armenia, Moldova, and the three Baltic republics. "We do not reject the idea

that there could be joint appeals by the 'six,'" A. Gorbunovs said. "But that is a question for the immediate future or longer term."

V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, put forward the idea of coordinating the independence declarations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. No document was signed after the discussion, A. Gorbunovs said.

### Latvian Communist Party's Rubiks Interviewed

PM2304145791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
12 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["Topical Interview" in Riga with Alfred Rubiks, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, by O. Meshkov; date not given: "People Are Pinning Their Hopes on Us and We Won't Let Them Down"]

[Text] [Meshkov] Alfred Petrovich, our country and party are experiencing a difficult time today. What characterizes the sociopolitical situation in Latvia?

[Rubiks] There is no denying that the situation is really acute. The People's Front, the Latvian National Independence Movement, and the organs of state power which obey them have effectively declared a complete break with the USSR. This has been done without considering the opinion of the whole population living in the republic. The question arises: What next? If the country's supreme organs of power and the USSR president cannot find arguments capable of inducing the republic's leaders to implement laws which are binding on everyone, there only remain two ways out. The first is to declare a state of emergency and introduce temporary presidential rule in the republic. The second is to let the opposing political forces here, let the population resolve the question of the republic's fate. If the second option is chosen it is not difficult to imagine how all this could end when the showdown comes.

I can already read the question in your eyes: Am I not laying it on a bit thick, is there really thunder in the air? The only person who can doubt the need for resolute measures is someone who is not very well informed about what is happening in the republic and who cannot see how all dissidence is suppressed today, up to and including switching off central radio and television broadcasts. Someone who has not seen the ciphers, codes, radio call signs, and nicknames of party and soviet activists due to be "neutralized" seized from the custodians of order. Someone who has not experienced for himself surveillance by people from the special armed volunteer militias and does not know of the existence of various bandit formations resurrected to fight the opponents of an independent party outside the USSR. And, finally, someone who did not see with their own eyes the massive violations of civil rights and USSR laws during the preparation and holding of the USSR referendum on

17 March. The leadership of the republic party organization has come to the conclusion that Latvia is on the verge of a coup d'etat. The confrontation among political forces is at its zenith. I repeat and insist that it is necessary to introduce a state of emergency and temporary presidential rule if bloodshed is to be avoided. Delay could have fatal consequences. Incidentally, such a conclusion was also drawn by the deputies commission which visited here in March at the USSR Supreme Soviet's behest.

[Meshkov] The economic situation, which is worsening daily, and the decline in working people's living standards are also surely helping develop negative processes in the republic?

[Rubiks] Certainly. I will give you a purely everyday example. A peasant in Latvia now sells a good cow for... 1,000 rubles [R]. Given current inflation and the depreciation of money, this, you will agree, is almost giving it away. This is desperation—there is nothing to feed the animal with.... Have Latvian peasants, who are inherently marvelous workers and managers, ever decided on such essentially tragic steps before? It is distressing to acknowledge this.

Summing up last year's results and assessing the state of affairs, the chairman of the republic Council of Ministers was forced to acknowledge: "We are rapidly heading for economic collapse." Latvia needs 2.7 million tonnes of grain to produce meat, milk, and white bread, but grain production only amounts to 1.5 million tonnes. We don't know how the shortfall can be made up this year. Nor do we know where light industry enterprises are to find the \$500 million needed to purchase imported raw materials. If these funds are not found, enterprises will come to a halt and massive unemployment will ensue.

As is well known, the Latvian Communist Party forecast this course of events and suggested a sensible way out of the approaching economic impasse, which has now become a reality. But our warnings were not heeded.

The Latvian Communist Party has always advocated participating in the signing of the new Union treaty and making use of the new relations in the economy for mutual benefit. However, our parliament's People's Front majority ignores the Union treaty. The attempt to replace it by economic ties among republics has produced no economic improvement.

[Meshkov] Alfred Petrovich, you get the impression that the republic government is now trying to use a sharp hike in prices to get out of the economic crisis....

[Rubiks] Both price hikes and downright draconian taxes. Matters have reached the point where even highly profitable enterprises are faced with the real threat of not having the money to pay wages. The republic's working people have responded to this with powerful protests and strikes. But there is a refusal to heed their voices and demands. While at the same time the gentlemen who have gotten hold of power are strenuously bent on

creating comfortable conditions for themselves—setting inordinately high salaries for themselves, acquiring cars, land, and scarce imported goods without restriction, and increasing expenditure on financing the institutions of state power and management several times over.

[Meshkov] There is now quite a lot of talk surrounding the Public Salvation Committee. It has become commonplace to describe such committees as "underground centers" organizing the struggle against the legitimately elected government. What can you say about this?

[Rubiks] Our All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee was transformed from the Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights and the USSR and Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitutions. It was set up not clandestinely, but at the first congress of the republic's democratic forces on 20 May 1990. Its creation and activity are fully in line with constitutional requirements.

The main aim is to fight for the observance of the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions and the implementation of the USSR president's decrees and to defend citizens' rights on the republic's territory.

Of course, the committee, as a public organization, includes many Communists. But the Communist Party as a whole has not joined it, just as other public organizations have not done so. Nevertheless, we all regard the committee's activity as useful and even essential and have therefore delegated our representatives as members of it. In my view, it should be given all-around support in our increasingly complex sociopolitical situation.

[Meshkov] But what are the Communist Party's current relations with such a mass public movement as the Latvian People's Front [LPF]?

[Rubiks] I am convinced that the LPF movement contains sensible people who sincerely want not just the Latvian people but all the other people living on the republic's territory to flourish and prosper. They scarcely support the unconstitutional actions of the radicals, who do not recognize the panhuman and international interpretation of human rights. There are undoubtedly among LPF members people who are well-versed in the history of our long-suffering Latvia and know what led it to align with fascism in the past. There are also quite a lot of people among them, too, who have not forgotten the history of the Latvian Red Riflemen and recall what they fought for and the ideals they upheld. They all realize, I think, that the current policy of the leadership of the LPF and the Citizens Congress will eventually bring misfortune upon the Latvian people.

The Latvian Communist Party states its readiness to sit down at the negotiating table with the so-called centrists from the LPF. We are also ready for dialogue with the radicals.

[Meshkov] Clearly the alliance between the LPF majority faction in the Supreme Soviet and the Latvian

Citizens Congress is driving the situation towards an impasse. What do you think?

[Rubiks] The alliance marks a very substantial regrouping of forces in the republic's political arena. The point is that the Latvian National Independence Movement (the Citizens Congress, the radical policy of Latvianizing Latvia, and the introduction of "Latvian citizenship as the first step toward complete independence" are its offspring), lacking a sufficient number of deputies' seats, has decided to "oblige" centrist deputies from the LPF to support its own policy and the policy of the Citizens Congress through this alliance. Thus the Citizens Congress, which before the alliance was represented by 17 seats in the Supreme Soviet, since its conclusion now has 131 seats in the majority faction. It seems that it can now dictate its will. It cannot be ruled out in this situation that the Supreme Soviet might merely adopt the version of citizenship as drafted by the Citizens Congress, that is, an extremely discriminatory law. As is well known, its crux is that only people who possessed Latvian citizenship prior to 17 June 1940 and their direct descendants will be declared citizens of the Latvian Republic.

As far as USSR citizens are concerned, in the Latvian National Independence Movement's opinion, Latvia has no obligations at all in respect of those people.

The LPF's position regarding the Citizens Congress has been spelled out with utter clarity in one of the documents adopted at the Third People's Front Congress: "The LPF supports the basic principles of the activity of the Latvian Republic Citizens Congress on the de facto restoration of the Latvian Republic and urges the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet to officially communicate in the very near future its attitude to the Citizens Congress—the lawful representative of the citizens of the Latvian Republic—and start constructive cooperation with it." There you have the sources of the alliance. But now tell me: Do the republic's working people have the right in such a situation to create an organization—the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee—to defend their rights?

[Meshkov] Does the Latvian Communist Party now enjoy quite wide support among the masses?

[Rubiks] There are quite a lot of supporters of our policy. This is despite the fact that the lion's share of the mass media in the republic is under the control of our political opponents. They hold complete sway on radio and television.

Yet the People's Front has not managed to achieve what it wants. Take, for example, the results of the poll held in the republic, which had but one aim—to justify the republic Supreme Soviet's ignoring the USSR referendum on Latvian territory. Under two-thirds of the total number of Latvian voters voted for Latvian state independence (outside the USSR is what is meant here, of course). That is, this alignment of votes in no way gives a negative answer to the question "Is Latvia to be

part of the USSR?" in holding the republic referendum envisaged by the Law on Secession? You need, moreover, to take account of the fact that servicemen, sailors, and fishermen are not now included in the number of voters. Given the current attitude toward servicemen in Latvia (they are described here as nothing less than occupiers, and they and the members of their families are deprived of basic human rights), it is easy to imagine the position they would adopt in a referendum.

No, we Communists have no doubts about the broad support we enjoy among all honest people and working people of Latvia. Our objectives are clear, and they are fully in keeping with their aspirations and ideas of justice and equal rights for all. We advocate a sovereign Soviet Latvia as part of a renewed USSR federation, a rule-of-law state, and the restoration of constitutional order throughout the territory of the Latvian SSR. And on the basis of the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions and USSR president's decrees. We advocate single citizenship and a citizenship zero option. That is, everyone who has a permanent residence permit on the day of the adoption of the Law on Citizenship has the right to be a citizen of Soviet Latvia.

The Latvian Communist Party is also opposed to the transfer of land into the private ownership of its former owners and favors a mixed economy with a preponderance of collective forms of ownership in all spheres of the national economy. And these aims of ours coincide with the interests of the majority of the republic's population. This is shown, incidentally, by numerous resolutions, appeals from labor collectives, and letters from citizens sent to the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

#### **Lithuania's Landsbergis Appeals to Gorbachev**

*LD2304212291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network  
in Russian 2052 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, has urged the president of the USSR to instruct a USSR delegation to begin constructive talks with a delegation of the Lithuanian Republic, and also to declare a fundamental rejection of the use of force and threats of force, thus creating a normal political atmosphere for talks between the USSR and the Lithuanian Republic. This appeal is contained in a memorandum that was handed by Bickauskas, the Lithuanian Republic's permanent representative in Moscow, to Mikhail Gorbachev.

#### **Lithuanian School Seized, Landsbergis Reacts**

*PM2304102191 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian  
11 Apr 91 p 1*

[Feature comprising ELTA report followed by Lithuanian Supreme Council Information Bureau account of remarks by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis: "Military Occupy 'Viltis' Training Center"]

[Text] Vilnius, 9 Apr—After a brief respite Soviet servicemen have again continued occupation actions in Vilnius: Today they occupied the "Viltis" Sports and Technical Association's technical school near Dvarcenis. This is a sports and training complex with auditoriums, garages, hangars, and a racetrack.

In the morning Major General Ginutis Taurinskas, who continues to refer to himself as chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] Central Committee (though he was not elected to the post last year), came into the office of Director Algis Ramanauskas accompanied by two colonels. He demanded that the school be placed in his control. In response to statements by both the director and Supreme Council Deputy Algimantas Norvilas, general director of the association, that this training center is the property of the Lithuanian Republic and the general is not competent to decide property questions because this is a prerogative of the talks between Lithuania and the USSR, Taurinskas snapped: "I'll show you what is within my competence."

A major who entered the office at that point reported: "The building has been taken under guard."

The uninvited guests demanded that the masters leave the school territory. In the yard military personnel with assault rifles threatened A. Norvilas and journalists who had arrived on the scene and confiscated a photographer's film. [ELTA report ends]

The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council Information Bureau has reported that Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis commented on these events as follows:

"From the USSR leadership's reaction we will immediately learn the scale and significance of this provocation. If no order comes from Moscow for the military to withdraw immediately, we will think that a new escalation of violent actions against Lithuania has begun. It may be linked with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's scheduled visit to Japan, because it is precisely in his absence or ostensibly without his knowledge that the heaviest blows are struck. Another probable explanation is the efforts by CPSU conservative forces and the military to torpedo the forthcoming talks between Lithuania and the USSR. Therefore, this is either an insult to the USSR political leadership or duplicity by that leadership. From Lithuania's viewpoint, it is a new display of Soviet military aggression and a strange response by the generals to the Lithuanian Government's efforts to improve the everyday life of Soviet servicemen."

Audrius Butkievicius, general director of the Territorial Defense Department, pointed out that on 4 April this year in Moscow the protocol of the official meeting between the Lithuanian and Soviet delegations enshrined, among other things, the following principles for the talks: preventing the use by either side of illegal

forms of mutual influence, and respect for other generally accepted legal principles. How can this be reconciled with the actions of the military?

#### **Lithuania Approves Privatization Commission**

*LD1004033291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian  
1900 GMT 9 Apr 91*

[Text] Well, today, following some brief discussions, the Supreme Council approved the Central Commission for Privatization which will be headed by Deputy Prime Minister Vytautas Pakalniskis.

The following are members of this commission:

Kestutis Glaveckas  
(Tautvydas Bliudeikis)  
Algimantas Matulevicius  
Antanas Mercaitis  
Albertas Simenas  
Stasys Vaitkavicius  
Marijonas Visakavicius  
Antanas Vidarskis

#### **Vagnorius Discusses Privatization, Economy**

*PM2304095391 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian  
12 Apr 91 p 1,4*

[A. Gasiunene report: "News Conference"]

[Text] Prime Minister G. Vagnorius' traditional meeting with journalists took place on the evening of 10 April after the government session. Vice Premier V. Pakalniskis also participated in the meeting.

Opening the meeting, G. Vagnorius said that the catastrophic situation in the USSR economy is bound to affect the course of affairs in Lithuania as well, but even so famine does not threaten us. Entire sectors of the Union economy are uncontrollable. However, even in the complex conditions we seek to maintain order and supply raw and other materials for state orders—that is, we seek a certain regulation of the economy. The premier went on to describe the transitional stage to the market economy, which primarily involves the privatization of state property and the freeing of prices. While in the recent price hikes it was possible to compensate partly for the loss in the population's income through supplementary payments, including from the budget, in freeing prices after a few months the government will try to link the growth in the population's actual expenditure with the growth rates for wages.

The problems of privatization, in themselves very difficult, are complicated today by the preparations for returning real estate in one form or another to the former owners. V. Pakalniskis announced that it is now becoming clear just how many people are claiming the return of real estate, and the government's task is to avoid infringing the rights of some residents of Lithuania while restoring the rights of others. Therefore, while recognizing the rights of former property owners, it is

also necessary to have a realistic idea of the current potential for satisfying these rights.

On 10 April it was planned to begin opening one-shot investment accounts for Lithuania's population giving people the right to acquire shares in part of the state property being privatized. The vice premier explained that this process is being delayed somewhat because all banking services are overloaded, but these accounts will be opened in the very near future.

Reference was made to rumors, this time about an increase in the price of gasoline. G. Vagnorius replied that no increase in gasoline prices is envisaged in Lithuania, but the possibility of such a move has not been ruled out in the USSR.

Another aspect of the economy is reciprocal goods exchanges with other republics and regions of the Union. In the first quarter Lithuania did not fulfill its pledges to deliver meat and dairy produce. Fears are emerging that the other side may take retaliatory measures.

The premier replied that the government is seeking to rectify the situation and that deliveries of meat and dairy produce to the center will be increased in the second quarter.

The press conference was moderated by A. Bocarovas, aide to the prime minister.

#### **Lithuania 'Imposing' Citizenship on Russians**

*PM2304092391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
17 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Correspondent Yu. Stroganov report: "Citizenship Via the Cash Office"]

[Text] Vilnius—Of course, the Lithuanian Legislature will call even this "surprise" an achievement of democracy and a manifestation of concern for people. Incidentally, hundreds of thousands of people affected by the "surprise" really will rejoice. In fulfillment of the republic Supreme Soviet resolution validating the law on the initial privatization of state property, the Lithuanian Government has approved a one-shot payment which persons who have decided to take citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic, which, in the opinion of its leadership, is outside the Union, can receive—it is estimated at up to 5,000 rubles per person.

So away with doubts! Down with thoughts of a constitutional conflict and of a violation of the rights of USSR citizens, who one fine morning seem to have found themselves in "another state." So you picture the sly grin of a jinni innocently shrugging his shoulders: There is no coercion, and it is up to everyone personally whether to take this citizenship. True, if you take it, you will go to the savings bank. If you do not take it, you will seriously complicate your life. What state, the jinni grins, would support foreign citizens? True, if you go to the savings

bank, you will not get the money, because it will go into so-called investment accounts. No ready cash exists....

I am meeting more and more people who wish to leave Lithuania. I leaf through the register at the Citizens Committee in which their applications are recorded. Today there are already tens of thousands of such people.

Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of the republic legislature, there is no violation of human rights in imposing Lithuanian citizenship on USSR citizens. I am not afraid of being reproached with the word "imposing." Just try to refuse if you have a family and children, if you have lived here for several decades and put down roots, as the saying goes. The desire to preserve USSR citizenship is fraught with consequences. Thus, despite previous repeated assurances that USSR citizens in Lithuania will lose "only" voting rights, the legislature is introducing material discrimination associated with the privatization process. Who will reassure the doubters now?

I have frequently heard in other places, too, the fears expressed to me at the Citizens Committee. People frequently put complaints to me. They maintain that one person was dismissed for belonging to the CPSU and another for his nationality, while yet another was cursed in a medical center for not knowing Lithuanian. "We are subjected to insults and humiliation," V. Fedorchuk of Kaunas claims in a letter to PRAVDA. "I am an ex-soldier and was gravely wounded near Siauliai," A. Gurin, a Great Patriotic War invalid and one of those who are now called "occupiers," recalls in a letter to the editorial office. "And so I stayed here to live and built Vilnius—I am a construction worker by trade. I know well what Lithuania was like. I lived among Lithuanians who were grateful to the Soviet Union for liberation. We felt no difference of nationality, for we were doing the same thing. Everything has changed because of 'Sajudis,' which has acceded to power and is leading the people to impoverishment and isolation."

Why is there a mass of such letters? It will be explained to me that people are simply encountering manifestations of everyday nationalism. But why has it blossomed? If parliament does not condemn demonstrations with the slogans "Ivan Go Home," if a statesman remarks that Russians are retarded, if the CPSU and Moscow are unequivocally blamed, without trial or investigation, for all the incidents that occur in the squares and streets, and if the Supreme Soviet is an indifferent onlooker in the debate over whether Lithuanian citizenship should be given to people who arrived after 1940, i.e. to "colonists," what is to be demanded of ordinary people?

The number of groups with instruction in Russian in the republic's higher educational institutions is being reduced today. In 1988 there were 52 out of 148 specialties, but now there are 25 out of 153. There have been no

Russians, Poles, or Belorussians in the Lithuanian Government since 11 March 1990. The percentage of "foreign speakers" in leading posts is falling.

Last year the philosopher A. Juozaitis, one of the creators of "Sajudis," said that "the political aims of our leadership were clearly revealed with the creation of the supernewspaper LIETUVOS AJDAS (state newspaper—Yu.S.). They are geared to the ideology and traditions of the tautininkas [nationalists]. And this cannot be concealed." Who are the tautininkas? The encyclopedia dictionary states: "Members of the Lithuanian party of the urban and rural big bourgeoisie and landowners during 1908-1940. Leader A. Smetona. On 17 December 1926, with the support of reactionary officers, members of the 'Lithuanian Council' (organ of power in Lithuania—Yu.S.) carried out a coup d'etat, setting up a fascist government. During 1941-1944 former members of the tautininka party collaborated with the German fascist occupiers."

I do not wish to accuse or unmask anyone here. I will merely seek to ensure that, in discussing the "Lithuanian situation" in order to find a way out of the impasse, the participants in the debate stand on solid ground and that the sun in Lithuania shines identically on everyone—on Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, Karaim, Jews, Belorussians.... On everyone.

#### **Lithuanian Faction Statement Supports Government**

LD2404084291 Vilnius International Service  
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] The Seventh Faction in the Lithuanian legislature, the last to have evolved, issued a statement today in which it detailed the faction's force in political life and expressed the desire to have the other factions take similar action.

Having announced its establishment several weeks ago, this faction was initially described as comprising deputies independent of other factions and not restricted, to any great extent, by one ideology or another.

Today's declaration states that the Seventh Faction, in basing its activity on the Sajudis election program, supports the current policy of establishing the Republic of Lithuania within the world community and the activity of the chairman of the Lithuanian legislature, who is implementing this policy, and that it is consolidating itself with the Government of Lithuania and its aim of strengthening the Lithuanian state.

The Seventh Faction has invited all the factions in the legislature which support such principles to seek possibilities of jointly forming a legislative presidium and permanent commissions.

These structures and [word indistinct] commissions were formed approximately one year ago, when the current factions were not yet in existence and the representation within them can truly be doubted currently.

### Lithuania Not To Permit Dual Citizenship

PM2304154591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
19 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, RIA, SIBINFORM, BALT-FAX, AZIYA-PRESS, TASS, REUTER, and UPI roundup: "Lithuania: Dual Citizenship Prohibited"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has added an article to the Law on Citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic. Now if a person acquires citizenship of another state he forfeits the right to citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic.

Thus dual citizenship is prohibited; it was hitherto permitted by the corresponding law adopted prior to the Act on Independence of 11 March 1990 by the former parliament, BALTFAX reports.

### Vilnius Notes Union Protest to FRG on Visit

LD2204171691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian  
0800 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Radio Free Europe notes several reasons which could have even prevented the Lithuanian deputies visit from taking place. Moscow, having learned of the Lithuanian deputies visit to Germany, issued a protest. German Foreign Minister Genscher informed the Bundestag leadership of this displeasure by the Union. For this reason the Lithuanian delegation was invited not by the Bundestag chairman but by one very friendly to Lithuania delegate [name indistinct].

Secondly, at the beginning of last week the idea of postponing the Lithuanian deputies visit arose among certain segments of government, most probably because on 25 April USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov was to arrive in Bonn. However, Lithuanian Legislature Deputy Antanas Raciunas who is currently in charge of the Lithuanian Information Center in Germany, succeeded in rallying a sufficient number of friends of Lithuania and overcame these difficulties.

The third reason that ought to be particularly unpleasant for us, and which was [words indistinct], gave rise to dissatisfaction and diminished the authority of Lithuanian representatives in the eyes of the [word indistinct]. It seems that [words indistinct] the danger arose also due to the fact that the Lithuanian Foreign Affairs Ministry staff members failed to process on time certain deputies' documents which were required to obtain entry visas. That is why a part of the delegation arrived a day later than scheduled. Such inertia on the part of Lithuanian Foreign Affairs Ministry staff members received a highly negative assessment from the conscientious Germans. What could one think of the Lithuanian representatives' competency if the ministry could not complete on time a task considered nearly one of the most elementary.

### RSFSR

#### Vorkuta Strikers Cable Demands to Pavlov

LD2304130691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network  
in Russian 1100 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] The Vorkuta city workers' strike committee has sent a cable to USSR Prime Minister Pavlov, urging him to sign an agreement with the Government of Russia on terms for transferring coal industry enterprises to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR. The Vorkuta city strike committee is linking the question of whether the strike is continued or halted directly to when such an agreement is signed.

#### 'All-Russia Warning Action' Set for 26 Apr

LD2304144491 Moscow Central Television First  
Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 23 Apr 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] According to the decision by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Federation of Independent Trade Unions, an all-Russia warning action of a protest is to take place on 26 April. The main trade union demands have a clear-cut socioeconomic nature. The country's president, the prime minister, as well as the RSFSR Supreme Soviet have been informed about them.

#### Silayev Discusses Talks in Washington

LD2304131191 Moscow TASS in English 1151 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Pavel Vanichkin and Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington April 23 TASS—Russian Premier Ivan Silayev, on a visit in the United States, met on Monday Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Brent Scowcroft, Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacher, Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan and Under Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger.

Silayev told TASS that he is satisfied with the results of the meetings and conversations with officials and, to a degree, with the administration's attitude towards processes taking place in the Soviet Union and in Russia.

He said it was apparent that people are very interested in stabilising and improving the economic situation in the Soviet Union.

Some officials expressed their determination to support the USSR and asked what needs to be done, he said.

"Russia's interests and its growing role in the foreign policy were apparently priority topics. We emphasised, however, that we are for the Union, that we support the main foreign policy actions of the USSR and its president. Noting that the biggest success has been achieved

precisely in the area of foreign policy, we declared the Russian leadership's support for new political thinking and improving mutual understanding with other countries, including the United States," Silayev said.

Noting the attention devoted to the economic situation in the USSR and the Russian Federation's attitude, Silayev said that he told U.S. officials about the Russian programme to stabilise the economy and transfer to market relations.

"American officials were very interested in the document. We stated that we favour implementing of the sovereignty of Russia and other republics. At the same time the Russian Federation, as was decided by the first congress of its people's deputies, is not going to withdraw from the USSR or give up its role as the cementing nucleus of a renewed union with greater economic sovereignty for its republics."

The Soviet Union's request for credits to purchase grain from the United States was discussed during a conversation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Silayev said. "We stated that we support this request. In the future republics will have more independence in foreign economic affairs and this will be reflected in the Union treaty."

"However, at the given stage, we do not see an alternative to credits for the USSR. In accordance with the new structure, they will be used proportionately and repaid by republics. I believe that our stand was received with understanding."

"I would like to note that many American states have stated their desire to cooperate with us, including those with which Russia has already established good relations, for instance with Alaska and Illinois. This wish, was, specifically, expressed at a meeting at the National Association of Governors of the United States. Prospects for the establishment of direct economic contacts with the Russian Federation and its separate regions and territories were discussed."

A positive attitude towards economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and directly with Russia, and to developing its new forms was expressed also at a meeting in the U.S. Department of Commerce, Silayev said. He noted that some concern was expressed regarding cooperation, since some U.S. entrepreneurs who have already established contacts with Soviet enterprises have not been paid on time for the products they supplied.

#### **Russian Deputies Say Land Reform Making Progress** *LD2304210891*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1539 GMT on 23 April, on the "Parliamentary Herald of Russia" program, carries a 14-minute interview with B.Ye. Nemtsov, a member of the Committee for Legislation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme

Soviet, and I.A. Vertogradskaya, a deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by RSFSR People's Deputy S.A. Nosovets.

Nosovets asks the deputy to explain why land reform has been delayed. Nemtsov says land reform is moving ahead, and that during the last month the number of peasant farmsteads increased by 5,000. The main reasons, according to Nemtsov, why people are not getting land are: farm chiefs begrudge land because the size of their state orders remains the same even though they have less land; a legislative muddle developed in the three weeks following a decision by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers, signed by Yeltsin and Silayev, to speed up land reform by proposing that 10 percent of the land designated for agriculture should be converted to orchards and kitchen gardens; the sharp increase in fares, sometimes six or sevenfold increases, on suburban transportation prevents people from getting to their lots; and there is a complete absence of land legislation.

Vertogradskaya says land reform is going ahead. She advocates a kinder attitude toward those who are trying to keep villages alive. She points to the need for centralized distribution of produce from private plots. She says local authorities and state farms are not necessarily opposed to land reform, but simply do not understand how to bring it about.

Nemtsov adds that with the price increases many families in his Omsk Oblast constituency are forced to till lots to avoid starvation. He complains that town dwellers have nowhere to store the produce they grow.

#### **Legislature Discusses Privatization Bills**

*LD2304193291 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT  
23 Apr 91*

[By TASS legislative correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—The Russian Government plans to privatise state property by giving it free to citizens of the republic. This provision has become the basis of two concepts of property "destatisation", submitted for consideration by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers Mikhail Malei presented a package of privatisation bills, drafted by the republican government. An alternative programme was advanced by a working group of several parliamentary committees and commissions.

Free transfer of property to the citizens of Russia is a common feature of the two blueprints, which make them different from a similar programme drafted by the union government which proposes to sell property to the population.

Malei told TASS that each citizen of the republic, irrespective of the age and place of residence, will receive an equal share of stocks, payment cheques or other securities. He or she will be able to use them to buy enterprises, housing and other state property offered by the republic.

Malei also said that privatisation will primarily affect enterprises producing consumer goods: Food, light and processing industries. This year alone, plans call for selling to the population 200-300 billion roubles' worth of state property (the total cost of Russian property is estimated at 1,000 billion roubles).

Russian people's deputies [as received] Petr Filippov, who presented an alternative privatisation concept from the working parliamentary group, stressed that authors of the programme also suggest creating a committee of the Russian Parliament to oversee the privatisation process.

Filippov said the package of bills to privatise state property contains 19 documents.

According to him, the bill "on the privatisation of housing in the Russian Federation", will be the first bill discussed by the parliament on April 25.

#### **Moscow Establishes Labor Solidarity Fund**

*LD2304053391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0030 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] By a decision of the Moscow city executive committee a labor solidarity fund [fond trudovoy solidarnosti] has been set up to strengthen working people's social protection against the threat and consequences of compulsory unemployment. A job center, or, to put it differently, a labor exchange, is permitted to open a bank account in the Kommercheskiy Narodnyy Bank [commercial People's Bank] and function as credit distributors. Voluntary contributions by organizations and individual citizens and proceeds from holding charity and other events and also funds earned on subbotniks [voluntary unpaid work on days off] are to become the sources from which the fund is built up.

#### **Meeting Considers North Ossetia Clashes**

*LD2204191191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Apr 91*

[Text] The situation brought about by the clashes between the Ossetians and Ingushes in Northern Ossetia has been considered at an expanded meeting of the presidium of the Chechen-Ingushetiya Supreme Soviet Presidium. It was noted that as a result of urgent actions by people's deputies, representatives of the clergy, and elders who are particularly well regarded among the highlanders, it has proved possible to take the edge of people's passions, and to prevent the further development of the conflict. But it is impossible to simplify the situation that has taken shape. Deputies arrived at the unanimous view that it is necessary by all means to warn

people against illegal actions. The council of Ministers of Chechen-Ingushetiya has been instructed to provide the necessary aid to the families of people injured in the clashes.

#### **RSFSR Constitutional Changes Assailed**

*PM2304132591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 3*

[Article by Professor V. Vishnyakov, doctor of juridical sciences and leading scientific associate at the USSR Supreme Soviet All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Soviet State Building and Legislation: "Difficult to Justify. Some Observations About Published Draft Laws"]

[Text] On 30 March 1991 ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA [Russian Newspaper] published the draft RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] law "on amendments and additions to the RSFSR Constitution (Basic Law)." This is already the third law since June of last year making amendments and additions to the RSFSR Constitution. But while the first two laws still preserved the RSFSR Constitution's structure, the principles enshrined in it, and the system of the republic's organs of power and government, the most recent law steers a course toward the RSFSR's full political and economic autonomy and opens the way for establishing a regime of personal power. What is at issue here?

The Second (Extraordinary) Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, which took place in December 1990, stated its determination to create a democratic rule-of-law state within a renewed USSR. The draft law of 30 March of this year mentions the USSR three times, but only on occasions when it is necessary to emphasize the independence and breadth of the RSFSR president's powers: He exercises "state representation" vis-a-vis USSR organs, leads the RSFSR's foreign policy within the limits of the powers envisaged by the USSR Constitution, and participates in ensuring the state and public security of the USSR.

In the text of the oath which, under the draft law, the RSFSR president must take when assuming office at the Congress of Russian Deputies, he swears to strictly observe only the RSFSR Constitution and laws. How can this be reconciled with Article 4 of the RSFSR Constitution, which states that state and public organizations and officials (and according to the draft law the RSFSR president is the highest RSFSR official) are obliged to observe the RSFSR Constitution, the USSR Constitution, RSFSR and USSR laws, and the constitutions and laws of the republics forming part of the RSFSR?

Both Article 4 and Article 76 are the main political guarantees for preserving the USSR's unity adopted by the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies 15 December 1990. Why then after four months are changes being made which indicate that the RSFSR president's decrees will be issued only on the basis of the RSFSR Constitution and RSFSR laws?

The new draft law strikes yet another blow against the principle of democratic centralism, which forms the basis of the organization and activities of the USSR's system of organs of power and management. Thus the RSFSR Council of Ministers, acting "under the RSFSR president's leadership," is empowered to resolve questions of state management, which are placed solely in the RSFSR's charge. This provision will lead to a contradiction with the USSR law "On the USSR Cabinet of Ministers," which has already been adopted.

The introduction of the post of RSFSR president greatly narrows the competence of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The president "leads" the activities of the Council of Ministers and can chair its sessions. The president "depersonalizes" and suppresses the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The draft law gives the president the right, with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's agreement, to appoint RSFSR Constitutional Court and RSFSR Supreme Court judges, the RSFSR chief state arbiter, and the RSFSR general prosecutor, as well as judges in kray and oblast and Moscow and Leningrad city courts and the collegium of the RSFSR State Board of Arbitration. The demand for "agreement" in exercising these and other powers is easily overcome. But if disagreements do occur, what is the procedure for resolving clashes in the event of a lack of agreement?

Thus the draft law enshrines an antidemocratic setup—the formation of the judiciary (general courts, the Constitutional Court, the Court of Arbitration) by president—the head of the executive. A blow is struck at the long established, generally accepted democratic system of appointment to the courts by election, and at the same time at the principle of the separation of powers.

Analysis of the content of the draft as a whole makes it possible to draw the conclusion that it muddles the question of demarcating between the legislative and executive branches. The functions of both the legislative and executive branches are mixed up in the president's powers, and moreover the powers granted to the president disrupt the mechanism of checks and balances.

Take for example the mechanism for "relieving" the president of his post if he "deliberately" violates the RSFSR Constitution or laws. The complex, multilevel, and time-consuming procedure of proving a deliberate violation begins with an RSFSR people's deputy, and only a deputy, and no other organ (chamber, commission etc.) can submit to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Constitution and Law Committee a proposal, along with explanations, to relieve the president of his post. The committee submits a proposal to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which by a two-thirds majority of the votes of members of each chamber can bring a charge against the RSFSR president of deliberately violating the RSFSR Constitution or RSFSR law. If such a charge is brought, the case is referred to the RSFSR Constitutional Court, which finds on the case by a majority of two thirds of its

members' votes. Let me remind you that this court's members are appointed by the RSFSR president.

What is more, if the RSFSR Constitutional Court confirms the fact of a deliberate violation by the president of the RSFSR Constitution or RSFSR law, the Congress of People's Deputies is convened and by a two-thirds majority of the legally empowered people's deputies can finally "relieve" the RSFSR president of his post.

Nothing can justify the president's "untouchability" and the "absence of controls" on him. His decrees cannot be repealed—even when they contravene the RSFSR Constitution and laws. Another nice point is that the draft does not mention the powers granted to the president by the draft RSFSR Constitution. In accordance with these powers, the president, in his capacity as the RSFSR Armed Forces' supreme commander in chief, can issue orders for the start of military operations in the event of an attack on the Federation, for partial or general mobilization, etc.

However, all these powers are effectively retained. The president has the right to take measures to ensure the state and public security of the RSFSR. All the aforementioned power and others can be subsumed in this broad formula.

The president's unchecked actions also include the right to dismiss the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, ministers, and other officials appointed by him without the agreement of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The "other" officials include, in particular, RSFSR Constitutional Court and RSFSR Supreme Court judges, the RSFSR chief state arbiter, and the RSFSR general prosecutor.

Given the RSFSR president's wide, authoritarian powers, his right to return a law with his own remarks for a second examination plays a negative role. The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, under the draft, can reject the RSFSR president's remarks and adopt the law on a second examination by a two-thirds majority of all the people's deputies, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet can reject the RSFSR president's remarks by adopting the law on a second examination by a two-thirds majority of all the members of each chamber. Foreign practice demonstrates, however, that as a rule the president can easily overcome such a mechanism of restraint.

The presidential model put forward by the draft law is based on unchecked personal power and is fundamentally at odds with the USSR president's legal status. And references to the fact that the RSFSR president issues decrees on the basis of the RSFSR Constitution and laws cannot fool anyone. We have already had all of this: on the basis of, in implementation of, and within the limits of the law. And there has not yet been a case in legal practice where the legality or illegality of adopted decrees has been established on such a shaky and uncertain basis. Only a clear demarcation of powers between organs of power and management on the basis of democratic principles and strict monitoring of their activities

by the representative organs can prevent events from developing in the direction of the usurpation of power. Unfortunately, the draft RSFSR law "on amendments and additions to the RSFSR Constitution (Basic Law) in view of the institution of the post of RSFSR president" does not meet these demands.

### 'Communist Initiative Movement' Congress Ends

PM2304142391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian  
22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent N. Volynskiy report: "Second Initiative Congress"]

[Text] Leningrad—The Second Initiative Congress of Russia's Communists, or, as its participants call themselves, the "Communist Initiative Movement," has spent two days working in Leningrad. More than 750 delegates—from 10 autonomous republics, three krais, and 42 oblasts—gathered in Political Education House. Communists from the Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, and Estonia were invited to participate in the work of the congress.

The agenda included two items—"On the Current Moment" and "Discussion of the Draft CPSU Program"—but the debate went far beyond the planned framework. Right from the start it acquired a sharply expressed critical hue. Many delegates see the deviation from the true Leninist principles of the new economic policy and from Communist ideals as the cause of the crisis in the country. Specific proposals were advanced from the rostrum.

It was pointed out that it is necessary to prepare right now for new elections to the soviets. The participants advocated the need to create a unified bloc of left-wing forces and to cooperate with the workers movement and the social democratic movement.

A number of documents were adopted, including appeals to the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum and the striking miners. While agreeing with the strikers' basic demands, at the same time the delegates called for an end to the strike, which is disastrous for the country.

The congress participants held a rally in defense of V.I. Lenin's name and the socialist gains. Flowers were placed at the monument to the leader outside the Smolnyy.

### National-Patriots Movements Seeks Return to Past

LD2004014691 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT  
18 Apr 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandorova]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The movement of "National-Patriots" gaining strength in Russia claims the role of a "third", alternative political force during the

confrontation between the ruling Soviet Communist Party and opposition from Democratic Russia.

The "Patriots" have taken a decisive step to rally their supporters when the coordination council of more than 40 Russian organisations "supporting national-patriotism" was formed in February 1991.

The council's chairman Eduard Volodin told TASS that the council includes people representing a wide political range of opinion—from Communists to monarchists.

Those who favour "the revival of great Russia" decided to oppose the economic and political programmes of both "Communist leaders" and "pseudo-democrats". They believe that "both are oriented towards the West and do not take into account historic traditions.

The other day the coordination council issued an address to Russia's citizens. It demanded the resignation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and of his main opponent, chief of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin.

Various Russian movements of the nationalist trend have not been particularly popular until now. Most of their candidates were defeated at the election of Russian people's deputies last year. "Each of us acted separately, and so we lost the elections. Now we have forgotten our political differences and are on the way to unity," Volodin said.

The "Patriots'" programme for Russia's economic stabilisation actually envisages the restoration of the past: the return to centralised economic management and achievement of the level of productivity that existed in 1985, when Gorbachev launched perestroika.

They believe that this process will take quite a few years and then it will be possible to consider the transition to a market.

Volodin said that if this transition is attempted immediately, "this will be the road to chaos and civil war."

They also spoke out against the hasty setting up of farmers' economies and say that "elimination of collective farms at the present stage will lead to famine in Russia."

Recognising the need for economic cooperation with the West "National-Patriots" believe that "a system shaping now will enable Western capital to rob Russia."

The "National-Patriots'" political programme is much more amorphous than its economic programme. They suggest that all parties be disbanded for the period of economic stabilisation and that "a slow, calm and cautious liberalisation of the regime" be embarked upon in a few years' time.

Who will begin the programme of the revival of "great Russia"? This will be done by "good" politicians and a "national government" which will replace the choice between Gorbachev and Yeltsin.

Volodin denies that a political party is being formed. We are not striving for power, he said again and again. However, one gets the impression that the party is already being formed.

"The restorers of the past" will try out their strength during the preparation for the election of a Russian president planned for June 12. The "patriotic movement" intends to participate in it actively. But Volodin said that it has not yet been decided if it will nominate its own presidential candidate.

### Western Republics

#### Protest Rally Continues in Minsk 23 Apr

LD2304173291 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Aleksey Zhuk from Minsk; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] Lenin Square in Minsk is again seething. Thousands of people have gathered. The political strike in Minsk has begun, or rather resumed. The stumbling block was the main question discussed at the talks between the strike committee and the Supreme Soviet Presidium: to convene or not to convene an emergency session. The Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to convene the next session on 21 May. The strike committee insisted on an emergency session being convened literally before 25 April.

And so the square is seething again. [video shows large crowd in square; two banners convey lack of confidence in Belorussian and Soviet Governments and call for those responsible for the Chernobyl cover-up to be brought to trial]

[Zhuk addressing man in crowd] What are your demands today?

[G.S. Mukhin, co-chairman of the strike committee] All we are demanding is that the Supreme Soviet Presidium convene an emergency session. All the excuses that there are no laws just are not true. This means that things are being dragged out. Our main demand is that the session must work. But clearly the Supreme Soviet Presidium does not want to convene a session. I cannot say what will happen next, but time will tell. We are ordinary people. We should be working at our machine-tools now. A long time, 15 days already, has passed since the first disturbances, and there have been no major decisions, no definite solutions to these problems. [passage omitted]

#### New Demands Issued

LD2304124591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1205 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Minsk, 23 Apr (BELTA-TASS)—According to estimates by militia staff, about 30,000 people had

assembled by midday today on Lenin Square in the center of Minsk. A brisk spring breeze spreads out slogans that are unusual for this square: "Army, Militia, KGB! The Workers are Fighting for our Common Freedom;" "Not a Single Kopek for the Center;" "Elections for President With all the People Voting."

Speaking one after the other, representatives of various labor collectives address the mass meeting. But the main topics essentially remain the same: the convening of an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic, the holding of fresh parliamentary elections on a multiparty basis, the removal of the party from all state structures, and the granting to the strike committee of 15 minutes' live air time on Belorussian television every day.

Aleksandr Galkevich, head of the press center of the Minsk strike committee, told a BELTA correspondent that more than 40 enterprises in the city have stopped work either fully or partially. Of the 15 towns in the republic where strike committees have been set up, 13 have confirmed their intention to join in the strike.

According to Aleksandr Galkevich, by 26 April—the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl tragedy—the Minsk strikers will be joined by most of the republic's major enterprises, primarily by those of Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts. New demands have been put forward: the bringing to criminal account of individuals guilty of concealing information about the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, and the taking of judicial action on behalf of the republic against the Union Government demanding compensation for the damage inflicted upon the people of Belorussia.

The strike committee has been notified of support for the Minsk strikers from the collectives of major enterprises in Vitebsk, Zhodino, Soligorsk, Lida, Rechitsa, and other towns in the republic.

Sergey Antonchik, cochairman of the strike committee, read a telegram at the mass meeting from the railwaymen of Orsa in which they give the following warning: If a decision to convene an extraordinary session of the republic's legislature is not taken by 1700 today, they will block the line leading to Moscow and the heart of the country.

#### Demands 'Strictly Political'

LD2304172191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1303 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Report by station correspondent Oleg Grdzilovich from Minsk]

[Text] In Minsk today, it is as if time has begun to go backward. Everything has gone back 19 days. As on 4 April, from early morning, lines of workers and students stretched along the city's main roads. A 30,000-strong

rally is continuing on the city's main square, Lenin Square, where only yesterday party leaders were laying flowers at the statue.

According to the strike committee's information, by 1200 today 36 enterprises in Minsk had halted work. The strikers' demands are strictly political. They are: the convening of an emergency session of the Supreme Soviet to examine a package of laws, whose drafts have been prepared based on the Belorussian People's Front position; the allocation of land as private property; new multiparty elections; and the removal of party control from enterprises.

In addition, the strikers are demanding that they again be given 15 minutes television airtime daily. After talks with the government ended on 18 April and the sides basically reached agreement on meeting the economic demands, live airtime for the strike committee was halted.

The third point of the demands also made in Lenin Square is the resignation of Stolyarov, chairman of the Belorussian State Television and Radio Committee.

Another very important item appeared today in the strike committee's package of demands: To sue the Union Government for the damage caused to the republic by the Chernobyl disaster and to call to account those who are really to blame for the disaster.

Now for the scope of the strike. On the list of those now on strike are such giants as the Minsk Tractor Works, the Vavilov Works, the Granat and Integral scientific and technical associations, the ball-bearing works, the worsted combine, and Gorizont. There is no information yet on whether these enterprises are completely at a halt, or whether only some shops have supported the strike. [passage indistinct]

The city's strike committee still has no accurate information about the scope of the strike in the republic. But it is known that the strike has been backed by enterprises of Orsha and Rechitsa. As before, four mines in Soligorsk continue to strike. Workers on the second shift of a number of Gomel enterprises are to begin a strike and a rally in the city's central square.

In conclusion, let me say that the republic's leadership was well aware of the political strike. They expected it but were evidently hoping that its scale would not be so significant. The question of how the Supreme Soviet Presidium, which categorically declared yesterday that there can be no question of holding a session before 21 May, will behave remains open.

### Thirteen Strike Committees Join

LD2304191391 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 1725 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] As BELTA correspondents report, the confrontation in Minsk continues. The leaders of the city strike committee kept their promise to bring people to the

square if all the political and economic demands of the strikers were not met. This morning, columns of workers started their way from Minsk enterprises to the square. According to the city militia directorate, about 20,000 people had gathered there by noon.

Aleksandr Galkevich, the Minsk strike committee leader, said that before noon, more than 40 of the capital's enterprises had stopped work completely or partially. Many of them sent their representatives to the square at a ratio of one demonstrator for every 100 working members of the collective. Out of the 15 strike committees that had been created in the city town, 13 expressed their intention to join the strike. Galkevich believes that by 26 April, the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl tragedy, the Minsk strikers will have been joined by the majority of the large enterprises of the republic—first by Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts.

Several white-red-white flags could be seen in the square. Is it that the Belorussian Popular Front has joined the strikers? Also among the rally participants are quite a few guests from neighboring Poland.

One after another, speakers went to the microphone. Their speeches contained severe accusations against the Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic, the Trade Union Federation of Belorussia, and the center. Reproaches were directed at the mass media as well.

For how long—along with the political strike—can the workers strike continue? We are not going to destroy the well-being of the workers with our own hands, Sergey Antonchik, the strike committee chairman, said. The plants will stop the strike sometime, and we will fight for the formation of a government that has the people's trust, he said. In a difficult situation, one should define one's position distinctly, and we have done this: The strike committee is the organization of the workers. People will go to the square again tomorrow for an answer from the Supreme Soviet, Antonchik said. We waited for one today, but did not get one.

### Ukrainian Law Adopted on Freedom of Conscience

LD2404082191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1708 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Kiev, 23 Apr (UNRINFORM-TASS)—A law of the Ukrainian SSR "On freedom of conscience and religious organizations" is to be an important condition for eliminating the division of society on religious grounds. It was adopted today by a majority of the Ukrainian legislature following a committed debate by representatives of all groups of deputies. [passage omitted]

The law is a reflection of the positive changes which have taken place in recent years in relations between the state and church and which have promoted the activity of religious organizations. [passage omitted]

The law simplifies in a fundamental way the procedure for official recognition of religious organizations. It envisages that a citizen has the right not only to share, but also to propagate religious convictions and to study religion not only in the family, but also with a religious organization, including those abroad, to claim alternative service in the army, to establish and maintain ties with people of the same faith abroad, to carry out pilgrimages abroad and to obtain and take away religious literature. [passage omitted]

The document which has been adopted repeats the paragraphs of the Constitution on the separation of church from state and of school from church, and also the equality of religious organizations before the law.

### Kravchuk Receives Hungarian Delegation

LD1904203191 Kiev International Service in English  
0000 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Today [18 April] Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, received a delegation of the Commission of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian State Assembly. An active part of Ukraine in European process is an indispensable necessity of our-day [as heard] international life. Our republic has to determine its historic identity as a European sovereign state, proceeding from a free choice of its political and economic system. And here Ukraine pays special attention to its relationship with Hungary. The latest contacts and agreements between the two states are a good testimony to this.

Speaking to the members of the Hungarian delegation, Leonid Kravchuk in particular said the following: We are deeply convinced that the visit of the Hungarian president to Ukraine and the signing of documents and agreements between our two republics would only favor the improvement of bilateral relations, and stimulate good perspectives for their considerable widening. And this has opened up for us a new possibility to work in all spheres of our relations, that is strengthening of cooperation in diplomacy, economy and culture. Our joint initiative concerning the ethnic minorities has gained a great political importance in the world. We have already adopted the law on external economic activity of Ukraine, and the law on Ukrainian National Bank, as well as discussed the draft law on customs. This means that we have already made several serious steps toward a real state sovereignty of our republic. The situation in the Ukraine, both economic and political, is rather complicated. But we have stepped on the road of discussions, coordinating commissions and round tables, striving to find mutual understanding in this way, said Leonid Kravchuk.

Then Gyula Horn, head of the Commission on Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian state assembly, took the floor: Today we had negotiations with Ukraine's minister for foreign affairs, and with the deputy chairman of the parliamentary Commission for Foreign Affairs. During these meetings both sides expressed their wish to develop

contacts between our countries. Actually, we pay a great attention to bilateral relations with the Soviet republics, especially our good neighbor, Ukraine, said Gyula Horn.

### Kravchuk Meets Von Weizsacker, Genscher in Bonn

LD2304014291 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1855 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn, 22 Apr (TASS)—Leonid Kravchuk, Ukraine Supreme Soviet chairman, who is here at the invitation of the Bavarian Landtag (legislature), met with FRG President Richard von Weizsacker and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher in Bonn today.

Leonid Kravchuk informed his interlocutors about the situation in the republic. Despite present difficulties it is, according to his words, characterized by a greater stability than other areas of the USSR. He stressed that the Ukraine is a sovereign republic, but it firmly intends to remain within a renewed Soviet Union. Its policy is aimed at stabilization, and not at destabilizing the USSR, the head of the Ukrainian legislature noted.

In the course of conversations the sides spoke in favor of deepening mutually beneficial economic cooperation. In this connection R. von Weizsacker welcomed the development of varied partnership relations between Bavaria and the Ukraine. Leonid Kravchuk thanked the government and citizens of Germany for the assistance given to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station accident.

H.-D. Genscher stressed that the FRG follows developments in the USSR attentively. Long-standing and traditionally good relations, which cannot be clouded by dark pages of the past, exist between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Germany, he said. The head of the German Foreign Ministry pointed out the great importance of the CSCE process, of which the Soviet Union is a full member. Development in Europe, in the minister's opinion, is not possible without Soviet participation. Presently, he said, deep structural changes are taking place in the USSR. We hope that all the participants in this process will show a democratic attitude, responsibility, and mutual understanding, and that it will not be accompanied by a rise in antagonism and egoism.

### Ukraine Official Says Borders 'Inviolable'

91UN1330A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA  
in Ukrainian 4 Apr 91 p. 3

["Political Display: Timely Interview" with A. Zlenko, minister of foreign affairs of the Ukrainian SSR, by unidentified RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent; place and date not given: "History Does Not Recognize a Return Path"]

[Text] [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Respected Anatoliy Maksymovych! Lately there have been increasingly frequent speeches by representatives of certain political groups and articles in the press of foreign countries which raise doubts about the existing borders of the USSR and even make territorial claims against the Ukraine. As the mail to the editorial office testifies, this has been troubling our readers more and more.

[Zlenko] I quite understand this concern. The problem of borders is a serious question in interstate relations which to a significant degree defines regional and international stability. The sad experience of our civilization shows that the pretext or reason for the most devastating and bloodiest military conflicts was territorial disputes. The last serious reminder of this for all of us was the Persian Gulf crisis. It is difficult for me to even imagine what would happen if a similar conflict were to break out in a densely populated Europe filled with nuclear weapons, nuclear power plants, and powerful high-technology factories.

Within this context I will note with pleasure that the question of European borders was decided definitively by the countries of the continent along with the United States and Canada with the adoption in 1975 of the Helsinki Final Act. However, this does not mean that there are no problems left. In some countries of Europe there are forces which, in contrast to the positions of their governments, would like to "carve out" the borders at their own discretion.

I can give you every assurance that preservation of the territorial integrity of the republic is one of the most important aims of the foreign policy of the Ukraine. In this we are guided by the provisions of the Declaration on State Sovereignty of the Ukraine and the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], which clearly and unambiguously state that **the territory of the Ukrainian SSR within the existing borders is inviolable and cannot be changed or utilized without its agreement.**

The Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is charged with conducting the foreign policy course of the Ukraine, is following the situation attentively. And not only following it but predicting the possible development of events. In conjunction with this I would like to emphasize that the aforementioned expansionist views with regard to our territory belong not to representatives of official circles but to individual journalists and members of some parties and groups, which attempt to use this in order to derive political capital.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Then what is your view of the well-known statement regarding the borders of the USSR by a representative of the U.S. State Department?

[Zlenko] Apparently you are thinking of the account published in IZVESTIYA within the last few days concerning the news conference at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I would not draw hasty conclusions and I would caution journalists to show maximum caution and attention when writing about such material. So far as

I know, the position of the U.S. Administration on the aforementioned issue remains unchanged, and according to preliminary information the official representative you mentioned was imprecise in his statement of his views. We have certainly paid attention to this statement. We were given instructions at the highest level to monitor the issue closely. If necessary, we will apply the diplomatic measures that are universally accepted in such instances.

But let us return to the previous question. Taking into consideration the appearance of such an alarming tendency (bearing in mind the appropriate statements), we will give this problem special attention in the development of bilateral ties with our neighbors. During official visits and negotiations at different levels our propositions for observation of the principle of territorial integrity and inviolability of borders are finding support. In particular, this is being reinforced in bilateral documents. For example, this principle was affirmed in the 27 September 1990 Joint Statement of L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, and A. Goncez, president of the Republic of Hungary, the 13 October 1990 Declaration on Principles and Basic Directions for the Development of Ukrainian-Polish Relations, and the 13 March 1991 Declaration on Principles and Goals of Relations Between the Ukrainian SSR and the Republic of Turkey. Contacts with official circles of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and Romania have proven that Prague and Bucharest are adhering to this principle in bilateral relations with us. Provisions concerning the inviolability of the borders of the republic are also contained in the texts of Ukrainian agreements with Russia and Belorussia. The establishment of provisions concerning the inviolability of borders with our neighbors contributes to the construction of an all-European home.

I am convinced that our direct participation in the all-European process and European structures would deprive political speculators who are trying to foment this nonexistent issue of any support.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Nonetheless, how justifiable in your view are the territorial claims against the Ukraine?

[Zlenko] My response is unambiguous—they are absolutely unfounded. The formation of our state borders was a long-term, complex, and at times tragic process that was completed after World War II.

During this period the existing borders of the USSR, and thus of the Ukraine, were legally fixed in a series of bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and the neighboring countries and also in multilateral agreements with the participation of the Ukrainian SSR. All these documents make up one of the essential elements of the postwar settlement in Europe.

Taking into consideration the importance of this issue, I will name these documents. They are, to begin with, the 16 August 1945 Soviet-Polish Treaty, which defines the

Soviet-Polish border for the most part in accordance with the so-called "Curzon line." In this fashion the final touch was put on the fulfillment of the ancient dream of the Ukrainian people—the reunification of East and West Ukraine in a single Ukrainian state.

In accordance with the 29 June 1945 treaty between the USSR and Czechoslovakia on the Transcarpathian Ukraine, the territory of Carpathian Ruthenia was returned to the republic.

The USSR's rights to Northern Bucovina and Bessarabia were restored by the 10 February 1947 peace treaty of the victorious states with Romania. And the border with Hungary was affirmed by the 1947 peace treaty, one of whose parties was also the Ukraine.

It is clear that the postwar development of international relations on the continent took place in affirmation of the principle of the territorial integrity of states and the inviolability of existing borders. Acknowledgement of this principle in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference contributed greatly to the success of the conference itself and to the establishment of a fundamentally new atmosphere of collaboration and mutual understanding in Europe. I remind you that it is no accident that the principles of territorial integrity and inviolability of borders are asserted in the Charter of the United Nations, and they have been confirmed as fundamental principles in modern international law. As a result, to cast doubt upon the existing borders in Europe means to cross out everything that has been achieved and turn back the hands of the clock to the times of the "Cold War" and confrontation. Not a single sober-minded politician will consider such a thing, and I hope that the peoples will not permit anyone to do it.

There is one last important point. The self-determination and reunification of the Ukrainian nation into a single state did not take place at anyone's expense and did not infringe on the interests of other peoples. The present state borders of the republic coincide with the historical borders.

In conclusion I would like to stress that the arguments and passions of any political figures around such a sensitive issue as state borders and territorial encroachment in regard to neighboring countries, including the Ukraine, may abate with the achievement of political and economic stability in the region. Our accomplishment of a new world order resulting in collaboration instead of confrontation and mutual understanding instead of ideological antagonism and our recognition of reality will undoubtedly lead people to agreement.

#### **Moldovans Welcome Party 'Stabilization' Proposals**

LD2104192891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak  
Network in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The proposals of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee on the stabilization of the social and political situation have been welcomed in the republic.

The people of the republic are discussing the proposals made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party with interest. This political document, which has been sent to the Moldovan legislature, mentions specific measures of a state and legal, socioeconomic, and interethnic nature, making it possible for the republic to emerge from a most difficult crisis situation. In the very near future, the document says, the Moldovan people will have to answer the most urgent questions: Is Moldova to be part of a renewed union of sovereign states, or not? Is there to be peace and civic accord in the republic?

#### **Caucasus**

#### **Gorbachev Signs Decree on Armenian Legislation**

LD2304171691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak  
Network in Russian 1630 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has signed a decree on acts adopted in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] which violate the rights of the public associations and citizens. The document states, in particular:

On 26 February 1991, the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic adopted a law on socio-political organizations in accordance with which bans are established on professions on political grounds and the activity of All-Union public associations and organizations is halted on the territory of Armenia. This contradicts articles of the USSR Constitution and the USSR's international obligations and discriminates against public organizations set up in the USSR. On 17 April of this year a decision was passed by the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic on the nationalization of the property of the Communist Party of Armenia and the former Leninist Communist Youth League of Armenia [LKSM]. In executing this decision, the republic's Council of Ministers, on 18 April 1991, published a decision which envisages specific measures to implement the illegal enactment of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR.

The USSR president's decree states that in accordance with the USSR Constitution and the USSR law on ensuring the force of laws and other legislative acts of the USSR, of 24 October 1990, the provisions of the new law of the Armenian SSR and the decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet, which contradict the legislation of the Union as a whole, have no juridical force from the moment of their adoption and are not subject to implementation by state and public bodies, enterprises, institutions, organizations, and citizens.

The instruction is to suspend execution of the decision of the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Armenian SSR of 18 April 1991 on the nationalization of the property of the Communist Party of Armenia and the former Armenian LKSM, as contradicting the USSR Constitution and USSR law.

**Armenian Communists Oppose Property Nationalization**

PM2304140991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
23 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[RIA Report: "Armenian Communists Defend Party Property"]

[Text] At an extraordinary Armenian Communist Party Central Committee plenum the republic's Communists accused the Armenian Supreme Soviet of violating the "law on property in the Republic of Armenia" and the persistent pursuit of an anticommunist policy. RIA reports. The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was convened in connection with the decision on the nationalization of the Communist Party's property adopted 17 April by the republic's Supreme Soviet. The statement asserts that the majority of Armenian Communist Party buildings were constructed using CPSU money and belong in full to the Armenian Communist Party.

According to a report from the SNARK news service the Armenian Communist Party has stated that it will defend party property by all legal means known to it.

**Nagorno-Kharabakh Town Shelled, Three Wounded**

LD2304175291 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent S. Mirzoyev]

[Text] Baku April 23 TASS—The town of Shusha, a district centre in Nagorno-Karabakh, was shelled today from anti-hail guns [as received] and machine guns. According to the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry, some 50 shells were fired from the neighbouring area, where Armenian villages are located, destroying three residential houses and damaging three more. Three civilians were wounded.

**Commission Blames Railroad Attacks on Armenia**

LD2304174791 Moscow TASS in English  
1102 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Natan Barsky]

[Text] Baku April 23 TASS—Azerbaijan's parliamentary commission on transport, communications and information issued a statement on the situation on the Azerbaijani railway.

The commission noted that the Azerbaijani side does not try to impose a rail or any other form of blockade on Armenia. To the contrary, Azerbaijani railmen, who operate freight trains running to Armenia and the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic within Azerbaijan, are systematically attacked by armed militants on the section that stretches through the Megrin District in Armenia.

Parliamentarians recalled 90 cases of attacks on trains, explosions and obstructions on tracks over the last two years, which killed Azerbaijani railmen, passengers and servicemen accompanying them. They emphasised that these actions were clearly provocative. The rail road is the only channel linking the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic with Azerbaijan. By staging constant provocations and acts of sabotage on this section, the Armenian side is out to cut off the Nakhichevan Republic with a complete blockade.

The commission stated that if such criminal actions on the Megrin section of the Azerbaijan railway continued, the Armenian leadership would shoulder the responsibility for the inevitable rupture of all communications links.

**Armenian, Azerbaijani Officials Hold Talks**

NC2304134591 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri  
1700 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] According to information an AZERINFORM correspondent has received from the rayon branches of the Azerbaijan Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, relative peace has reigned in the Azerbaijani rayons which border Armenia for the past few days. Nevertheless, armed men have been observed assembling in the residential areas in Armenia which border our republic.

Meanwhile, the leading officials of the local law enforcement organs of the Ordubadskiy Rayon in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic and the Megrinskiy and [name indistinct] Rayons in Armenia met in the Ordubad-Megri border area on 12 April. Matters related to the question of maintaining safe and uninterrupted railway transportation in the Megri section of the Azerbaijani railways network were discussed.

**MVD Troops Confiscate Arms in South Ossetia**

LD2304153491 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 23 TASS—In accordance with the Soviet president's decree, units of forces of the USSR Interior Ministry [MVD] continue to disarm illegal groups and units operating in the territory of South Ossetia which is in the composition of the Georgian republic.

A large amount of firearms and blank arms, combat and hand-made grenades, grenade launchers, explosives, portable radio stations and tens of thousands of cartridges of various calibre were confiscated in the past two days. Some 40 Georgians and Ossets were detained. However, more units come to the assistance of Georgian militants from other Georgian districts. TASS learned at the press centre of the Extraordinary Committee of the Parliament of the North Ossetian Republic that last night Georgian militants opened fire on residential areas of

Tskhinvali from the direction of Nikozi village. There is no information about casualties.

A cordon of Soviet Interior Ministry servicemen was fired at from Nikozi. Soldiers were ordered to return the fire.

Last night unidentified persons in Tskhinvali set several residential houses on fire. The military frustrated an attempt to explode buses running on city routes.

An armed clash between Georgian militants and local people took place in Abano village of Znaur district.

Nine Ossets were taken as hostages and carried for an unknown destination.

Tskhinvali remains blockaded. Industrial enterprises, building organisations, the railway station and communal services in Tskhinvali do not operate for the fourth month. There is no telephone and telegraph communication with districts of South Ossetia and with Vladikavkaz. The city has not been supplied with electricity for over three weeks.

The supply of water and gas is unsteady. Routes to the regional centre are controlled by Georgian militants.

Columns of trucks loaded with food products and articles meant for humanitarian assistance can reach Tskhinvali from Dzhava along the main route only if heavily guarded by military.

Refugees from south Ossetia and internal districts of Georgia inhabited by Ossets continue to arrive in North Ossetia. More than 20,000 refugees, among them some 10,000 children, have been registered in Vladikavkaz.

The problem of accommodating refugees from Transcaucasia is extremely acute. In the recent days there were more cases in Vladikavkaz when Georgian residents received telephone calls with threats of violence. (There are more than 12,000 Georgian nationals in Vladikavkaz).

#### **Georgians Denounce New Tskhinvali Procurator**

AU2404095091 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian  
0200 GMT 24 Apr 91

[Text] The press center of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs has informed us that, on 22 and 23 April, it was relatively quiet in Tskhinvali and its surrounding villages. During the night, sporadic gunfire was heard only from the direction of the town.

As you know, up to now, 20 or more Georgian citizens have been detained, including Demer Gugua and Alek'si Nisharashvili, militia workers from Rustavi.

On 23 April, militia representatives from Rustavi arrived in Tskhinvali to present the investigation with character references of their two colleagues and proof that they did not have automatic weapons.

[Name indistinct] Kukhayev, who was illegally appointed procurator of Tskhinvali rayon by the so-called National Salvation Committee and who has been entrusted to take charge of the investigation of the Georgians, ignored the documents brought from Rustavi and proposed the release of all the Georgians in exchange for the return of (?Robert) Bestaev.

Bestaev, who is being detained by the Georgian law-enforcement organs, has been accused of having committed a most serious crime. This condition set by the extremist Kukhayev is no surprise. What is surprising and disgraceful is that such a person can be called a servant of justice.

#### **Georgia President Proposes Referendum for Ossetians**

LD2304193991 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1419 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By SAKINFORM correspondents Paata Tsintsadze and Eduard Ebideridze]

[Excerpt] Tbilisi, 23 Apr (TASS)—"There is just one way to reach a democratic solution of the crisis in the former South Ossetia, and that is to hold a referendum among Georgian residents of Ossetian nationality. They would have to say whether they agree to reconstruct their autonomous oblast," stated Georgia President Zviad Gamsakhurdia, at a routine session of the republic's parliament today. In his opinion, after such a referendum it would be impossible for the world community to accuse Georgia of being inhumane and violating human rights. [passage omitted]

#### **Georgian Foreign Minister Holds News Conference**

LD2304223391 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT  
23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Roman Grigoryev]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Georgia is planning to broaden its foreign political contacts, republican Foreign Minister Georgiy Khoshtaria told a news conference here today. He has just returned from an unofficial visit to France.

Khoshtaria noted that despite the fact that he was not received by the French foreign minister, he is quite satisfied with the results of his visit.

"We agreed with French colleagues to open the Georgian house in Paris and the French consulate in Tbilisi," the minister said. "The West is paying more attention to republics, including Georgia."

The minister said the political situation in Georgia is "very tense". He laid the blame for this on central authorities. "The centre could disarm all military formations in one day, but it does not want this. Georgia will not bend to the centre's diktat," Khoshtaria said.

"We are developing ties with our neighbours, Azerbaijan and Armenia. Our republic has proclaimed independence, but this does not mean that we are going to break

our traditional ties. We are planning to broaden them on a new basis," Khoshtaria said.

#### **Georgia Adopts Prefecture Law**

*LD2304194191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 23 Apr 91*

[Text] A law on the prefecture was adopted today at a session of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia. In accordance with this document, the prefect is the top official in the rayon, and in towns subordinate to the republic. On the territory within his jurisdiction, he implements state policy and economic and sociocultural development. The prefect is responsible to, and reports back to, the president of Georgia, the Supreme Soviet and the government of the Republic. In autonomous republics he is responsible to the supreme soviets and the councils of ministers of these republics.